

the United States within two years after his proclamation recognizing the independence of the Philippine Islands.

"(3) That the officials elected pursuant to the provisions of this act for the Philippine government to be formed under the constitution thereof shall be constitutional officers of said government and qualified to function in all respects as if elected directly pursuant to the provisions of the constitution, and shall serve their full terms of office as prescribed in the constitution.

"(4) That the debts and liabilities of the Philippine Islands, its Provinces, cities, municipalities, and instrumentalities, which shall be valid, and subsisting at the time of the approval of the proposed constitution, shall be assumed by the government established thereunder; and that where bonds have been issued under authority of an act of Congress of the United States by the Philippine Islands or any Province, city, or municipality therein, the Philippine government will make adequate provision for the necessary funds for the payment of interest and principal, and such obligations shall be a first lien on the taxes collected in the Philippine Islands.

"(5) That by way of further assurance the government of the Philippine Islands will embody the foregoing provisions (except paragraph 3) in a permanent treaty with the United States.

"Sec. 3. If a constitution is formed in compliance with the provisions of this act, the said constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Philippine Islands for their ratification or rejection, at an election to be held within eight months after the completion of the constitution, on a date fixed by the Philippine Legislature, at which election the qualified voters of the Philippine Islands shall have an opportunity to vote directly for or against the proposed constitution, or for or against any proposition separately submitted. Such election shall be held in such manner as may be prescribed by the Philippine Legislature, to which the return of the election shall be made. The Philippine Legislature shall by law provide for the canvassing of the return and if a majority of the votes cast on that question shall be for the constitution, shall certify the result to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon, and upon separate propositions, and a copy of said constitution, propositions, and ordinances.

"Sec. 4. The Governor General of the Philippine Islands shall, within six months after the receipt of such certification, issue a proclamation for the election of the officials provided for in the constitution, such election to take place not earlier than six months nor later than eight months from the date of the proclamation of the Governor General. The election of such officials shall be held in such manner as may be prescribed by the Philippine Legislature.

"Sec. 5. The returns of the election of the officials for the independent government of the Philippine Islands shall be certified by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands to the President of the United States, who shall, within four months after the receipt of such certification, issue a proclamation reciting the facts of the formation of the constitution for the Philippine Islands and the election of the officials provided for in such constitution as hereinbefore provided, announcing the results of such election, and designating a time, not earlier than six months and not later than one year after the date of the issuance of such proclamation, when the government of the Philippine Islands will be turned over to the duly elected officers, and such officers will begin to function under the constitution. At the time designated in such proclamation the President of the United States shall withdraw and surrender all rights of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the Territory and people of the Philippine Islands, and, on behalf of the United States, shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, except that the President shall reserve to the United States such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may at the time of the transfer be possessed by the United States as naval bases or coaling stations.

"Sec. 6. Upon the proclamation and recognition of the independence of the Philippine Islands under their constitution, the President shall notify the governments with which the United States is in diplomatic correspondence thereof and invite said governments to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands."

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, before making a motion to adjourn, I desire to state that the principal controversial items in the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill have been discussed frequently on the floor of the Senate during the last few months, I think, are well understood and can be settled without undue debate. The committee has labored hard for weeks on this bill. As I have already stated, over 1,250 pages of data have been collected by the committee and published in its reports. After the Senate meets on Monday when it takes up this bill, I shall ask that it remain in session Monday evening until the bill is completed. This will be necessary in order

that the bill can be finally passed before the end of the fiscal year on June 30.

Now, Mr. President, in pursuance of the previous unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, June 27, 1932, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1932

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., LL. D., minister of the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, frail children of earth's fleeting scenes, we lift lame hands of prayer to Thee, who art from everlasting to everlasting. The present, persistent and pressing, so often dims the vision splendid and robs us of the far look. From the grinding daily schedules which drain our strength and enmesh our hearts and minds we would for this moment gaze up and out and away to the eternal principles which give worth and meaning to all that we do or say here. We would lean our weariness, our weakness, our ignorance against the moral pillars of the universe which were there before we entered this mortal scene and which will remain when we have played our brief moment upon the changing stage of life.

Help us to toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal. Sober us by a revealing glimpse of the crimson paths down which the benedictions which crown our days have reached us. Steady us with the expectant gaze of the cloud of witnesses which these historic halls recall. Purge our hearts of unworthy entanglements and shabby motives which may mar and blot the future's broadening way. Save us from discouragement and cynicism by the radiant faith that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope but up to sunnier heights and wider vistas of an illumined freedom which shall yet flame as a beacon of hope for the whole world. Thou who through storm and night art still guiding and guarding, to Thee aloud we cry, "God save the state." In His name we ask it. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. Moses and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dale	Keyes	Shipstead
Austin	Davis	La Follette	Shortridge
Barbour	Dickinson	McGill	Smoot
Bingham	Fletcher	McNary	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	Metcalf	Stephens
Blaine	George	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Hale	Norris	Townsend
Brookhart	Hastings	Nye	Trammell
Bulow	Hatfield	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Coolidge	Hebert	Reed	Watson
Copeland	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	White
Costigan	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	
Couzens	Kendrick	Sheppard	

Mr. ODDIE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] are detained in the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar under Rule VIII and the clerk will state the first bill for consideration, beginning at the point reached the last time the calendar was called.

#### CARE OF VETERANS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. Will it be proper for me to introduce a resolution that it may be printed and lie on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] if he objects? I want to introduce the resolution and have it printed and lie over until it can be considered. Would the Senator resist that request? The resolution relates to the care of veterans in the District.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the desire of the Senator simply to offer it and not to discuss it?

Mr. COPELAND. That is all.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. COPELAND. I submit the resolution and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 253) was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the health and welfare of the District of Columbia and its permanent and transient inhabitants are menaced by existing conditions: Be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated and placed at the disposal of the Commissioners of Health and Police of the District of Columbia and expended with the approval of the President of the United States. This fund may be used for the benefit of transient veterans to return them to their homes or to care for them here temporarily.

#### FEES OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar under the order.

The bill (S. 4851) to amend section 5202, United States Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 2, sec. 82), and for other purposes, was announced as first in order, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this appears to be an important bill, and I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] to make a brief explanation of its provisions.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, there are two sections in the bill that are quite distinct from each other.

The first section has to do with the loans of member banks from the National Credit Corporation. I have taken this matter up with the Comptroller of the Currency and Treasury Department this morning. The comptroller is entirely willing to set aside the first provision of the bill and to have the bill amended by striking out the first section and leaving section 2, which is quite simple, and it seems to me quite proper. It provides that the comptroller shall be allowed to make the usual charges for trust business with member banks. The trust business, it seems, has increased at a very great rate during the last two years, and the comptroller's office is not being adequately compensated. The Treasury Department desires authority to charge the usual fees on account of this additional business and the extra work entailed on his office.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator if the bill as he desires it passed relates only to fees that may be charged for bank examinations?

Mr. WALCOTT. Yes; but I am going to move, Mr. President, that the bill be amended by striking out the first part of the measure down to section 2, simply retaining the enacting clause and making section 2 the body of the bill, giving the comptroller the authority to charge the necessary fees for this additional trust business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1 it is proposed to strike out from line 3 to line 11, inclusive, as follows:

That section 5202, United States Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 2, sec. 82), be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Ninth. Liabilities incurred directly or indirectly by borrowing individually or in association with other banks from 'The National Credit Corporation,' a Delaware corporation, or 'National Credit Corporation,' a New York banking corporation, or from an association of banks which in turn borrow from such designated corporations."

So as to make the bill read:

That section 5240, United States Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 3, secs. 481, 482, 483, 484, 485), be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph reading:

"In addition to the expense of examination to be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency as heretofore provided, all national banks exercising fiduciary powers under the provisions of section 11 (k) of the Federal reserve act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 3, sec. 248 (k)), and all banks or trust companies exercising fiduciary powers in the District of Columbia shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency for the examinations of such fiduciary powers, a fee in proportion to the amount of individual trust assets under administration and the total bonds and/or notes outstanding under corporate bond and/or note issues for which the banks or trust companies are acting as trustees upon the dates of examination of the various banks or trust companies."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the bill as introduced had the approval of the Comptroller and the Secretary of the Treasury. I can see no possible objection to the amendment; but I thought the bill as reported had the approval of the Treasury Department.

Mr. WALCOTT. That is correct. It did have the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency; it was his bill; but inasmuch as the first section involves the National Credit Corporation and inasmuch as that has been rather a disputed and controversial point, the comptroller is willing to waive the first part of the bill. However, the second provision is quite important, involving revenue to the Treasury for work that it does.

Mr. FLETCHER. I quite agree to that. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS EAST BRANCH OF NIAGARA RIVER

The bill (S. 4830) granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y., was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, Order of Business 934, being House bill 12078, is identical with the bill the title of which has been stated. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill, and later I shall ask that the Senate bill may be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12078) granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y., which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 17, 1930, to be built by the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, a State commission created by act of the Legislature of the State of New York, chapter 594 of the Laws of 1929, across the east branch of the Niagara River, from the city of Niagara Falls, in the county of Niagara and State of New York, at a point east of Evershed Avenue, in said city of Niagara Falls, to Grand Island, in the county of Erie and State of New York, are hereby extended two and five years, respectively, from June 17, 1932.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 4830 will be indefinitely postponed.



## EXCLUSION AND EXPULSION OF ALIEN COMMUNISTS

The bill (H. R. 12044) to provide for the exclusion and expulsion of alien communists was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TRAMMELL subsequently said: Mr. President, did some Senator object to the consideration of House bill 12044?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] objected to its consideration.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I had very much hoped that that bill might be considered. It is a very important bill and has already passed the House of Representatives. If we do not have another call of the calendar, the bill can not be passed at this session.

## REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY

The bill (H. R. 4743) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, this is to continue the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation in the various States. The reason we are asking for action now is that it is necessary for various State legislatures to take action; so that by having early notice they will know of the intention of Congress, and we shall be able to encourage this very desirable work which has been under way for some time.

This bill has passed the other House, where it was known as the Bankhead bill. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will permit it to pass.

Mr. BRATTON. I think we shall be compelled to curtail appropriations for vocational education.

Mr. COPELAND. It is essential that the bill should be passed in order that the States may know the policy of Congress and whether appropriations for this work will be continued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over on objection of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico does not object to the consideration of the bill, and I hope the Senator from Utah will not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah insist on his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is there any possibility of persuading the Senator from Utah to allow us to consider this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I have had an opportunity to read only a portion of the report, and I should like to obtain further information regarding it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not to pass the bill means the wrecking of work that has been going on to rehabilitate those who are incapacitated. Extensive hearings were held by the committee, and unless action is obtained at this session it means the States will not be in a position to go forward with this work. I am sure the Senator from Utah is concerned with the humanitarian aspects of this problem.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, this matter has been controverted for quite a long time. The Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings on the bill. The measure has also received the consideration of the White House, and it agreed to an extension of this service for a period of years. Even when there was being considered a consolidation of various bureaus, boards, and commissions, the President issued a public statement in which he expressed the view that this work should continue. There are many State agencies which are now actively engaged in this

work. Certainly the bill should be approved, and I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah insist upon his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want the bill to go over to-day, as I desire to secure some information other than that which is contained in the report.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will not the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I will withhold it if the Senator desires to speak on the bill, but I am going to object to its passage to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the point is that in all probability another opportunity may not arise to consider this measure at this session, and the objection will accomplish its defeat.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah knows all about this bill; the Senator has been familiar with the discussions of the question involved for many years. He knows the purpose of the bill. It simply provides an extension of the same law which we have had for a great number of years. I am unable to see the purpose of the Senator in trying to defeat the proposed legislation for this term, because the Senator knows in all probability that we will not have another opportunity to consider it again at this session.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think so; I think we are going to have an opportunity, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. COUZENS. If the Senator desires to study the matter, why does he not let the bill go through and then file a motion to reconsider, as I did in the case of a bill in which he was interested some days ago? I did not insist upon holding it up in order that one Senator might make a study of its provisions. The Senator can do the same. If we pass this bill and he does not like it after he has looked into it, he can file a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the bill incorporates no new provisions; it merely carries forward the work that is being done under existing law.

Mr. COUZENS. That is correct. There are many State agencies that are rehabilitating persons who have been crippled in industry. While we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain an Army and a Navy and economic bureaus and the Farm Board, there seems to be a disposition here to cut off a very minor amount which will result in crippling the rehabilitation of persons who have been injured in industry. It is unjustifiable and uncalled for.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It appears that already 50,000 persons have been rehabilitated and rendered self-supporting and that 25,000 are now being served. It would be tragic to discontinue this service, particularly under present conditions.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no desire whatever to interfere with the bill. I have not had an opportunity to read in full the report. I should like to know how much money is involved. The report does not show anything about that, so far as I can see.

Mr. COUZENS. The bill is very short. It proposes to extend over a number of years, until 1937, the provisions of the act now in existence and which has been in operation for many, many years. There is no new principle involved; it is merely a continuation of an annual appropriation over a period of years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It carries a million dollars a year for four years.

Mr. SMOOT. It carries \$4,000,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It carries \$1,000,000 a year for four years.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection if there is a limitation.

Mr. COUZENS. There is a limitation to 1937.



Mr. SMOOT. If there were no limitation, then I would object.

Mr. COUZENS. As I have said, there is a limitation.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if there is a limitation, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah withdraws his objection.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 31 and 32), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their placement in employment, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the sum of \$1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the sum of \$1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, the sum of \$1,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, the sum of \$1,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their populations bear to the total population in the United States, not including Territories, outlying possessions, and the District of Columbia, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotments of funds to any State shall not be less than a minimum of \$10,000 for any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That such portions of the sums allotted that will not be used in any fiscal year may be allotted in that year proportionately to the States which are prepared through available State funds to use the additional Federal funds. And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1934, June 30, 1935, June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, the sum of \$97,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States provided for in this section.

"All money expended under the provisions of this act from appropriations authorized by section 1 shall be upon the condition (1) that for each dollar of Federal money expended there shall be expended in the State under the supervision and control of the State board at least an equal amount for the same purpose: *Provided*, That no portion of the appropriations authorized by this act shall be used by any institution for handicapped persons except for vocational rehabilitation of such individuals entitled to the benefits of this act as shall be determined by the Federal board; (2) that the State board shall annually submit to the Federal board for approval plans showing (a) the plan of administration and supervision of the work; (b) the qualifications of directors, supervisors, and other employees; and (c) the policies and methods of carrying on the work; (3) that the State board shall make an annual report to the Federal board on or before September 1 of each year on the work done in the State and on the receipts and expenditures of money under the provisions of this act; (4) that no portion of any money authorized to be appropriated by this act for the benefit of the States shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of any lands; (5) that all vocational rehabilitation service given under the supervision and control of the State board shall be available, under such rules and regulations as the Federal board shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty."

Sec. 2. Section 3 of such act of June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 34), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations authorized by section 1 any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, (1) accept the provisions of this act; (2) empower and direct the board designated or created as the State board for vocational education to cooperate in the administration of the provisions of the vocational education act, approved February 23, 1917 (U. S. C., title 20, ch. 2), to cooperate as herein provided with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration of the provisions of this act; (3) in those States where a State workmen's compensation board, or other State board, department, or agency exists, charged with the administration of the State workmen's compensation or liability laws, the legislature shall provide that a plan of cooperation be formulated between such State board, department, or agency and the State board charged with the administration of this act, such plan to be effective when approved by the governor of the State; (4) provide for the supervision and support of the program of vocational rehabilitation to be provided by the State board in carrying out the provisions of this act; (5) appoint as custodian for said appropriations its State treasurer, who shall receive and provide for the proper custody and disbursement of all money paid to the State from said appropriations: *Provided*, That any State which, prior to June 30, 1933, has accepted and otherwise complied with the provisions of the act of June 2, 1920, as amended June 5, 1924, as amended June 9, 1930, shall be deemed to have accepted and complied with the provisions of this amendment to said act."

Sec. 3. Section 5 of such act of June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 34), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of the Federal board as provided in this act, shall pay in

equal semiannual payments, on the 1st day of July and January of each year, to the custodian of each State appointed as herein provided the moneys to which it is entitled under the provisions of this act. The money so received by the custodian for any State shall be paid out on the requisition of the State board as reimbursement for services already rendered or expenditures already incurred and approved by said State board. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall make an annual report to the Congress on or before December 1 on the administration of this act and shall include in such report the reports made by the State boards on the administration of this act by each State and the expenditure of the money allotted to each State."

Sec. 4. Section 6 of such act of June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 39), is amended as follows:

"Sec. 6. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Board for Vocational Education the sum of \$80,000 annually for a period of four years, commencing July 1, 1933, for the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by this act, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders, including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, and all other necessary expenses."

Sec. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1933.

#### GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "on," to strike out "October 11 of each year" and insert "October 11, 1932," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1932, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1932, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski."

#### BOISE NATIONAL FOREST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4497) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the following-described lands are hereby added to the Boise National Forest, Idaho, and made subject to all laws applicable to national forests" and insert "That, subject to any valid existing claim or entry, and to any withdrawals heretofore made, all lands of the United States within the areas hereinafter described be, and the same are hereby, added to and made parts of the Boise National Forest, Idaho, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests; and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within said described areas," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, subject to any valid existing claim or entry, and to any withdrawals heretofore made, all lands of the United States within the areas hereinafter described be, and the same are hereby, added to and made parts of the Boise National Forest, Idaho, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests; and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, are



hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within said described areas:

Sections 25 and 26; east half section 27; east half section 34; and section 35; township 8 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 and 2; sections 11 to 14, inclusive; sections 23 to 27, inclusive; and sections 34 to 36, inclusive; township 7 north, range 3 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, and 3; sections 6 and 7; sections 10 to 13, inclusive; and sections 15 to 36, inclusive; township 7 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 and 2; sections 4 to 28, inclusive; and sections 30 to 36, inclusive; township 7 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive; sections 10 to 15, inclusive; sections 22 to 27, inclusive; and sections 34 to 36, inclusive; township 6 north, range 3 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 6 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 21, inclusive; sections 24 and 25; and sections 28 to 36, inclusive; township 6 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 6 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 and 2; sections 11 to 14, inclusive; sections 23 to 26, inclusive; and sections 35 and 36; township 5 north, range 2 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 5 north, range 3 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 5 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 5 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive; sections 8 to 17, inclusive; sections 21 to 27, inclusive; and sections 35 and 36, township 4 north, range 3 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 4 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, 11, and 12, township 3 north, range 3 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive; and northwest quarter of section 14; township 3 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian; not heretofore included within the Boise National Forest, Idaho; all ranges east, Boise meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LANDS IN GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4522) to authorize the conveyance to the State of Tennessee of certain land deeded to the United States for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and not needed therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "therefor," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That the proceeds of the sale of said land by the State of Tennessee shall be applied to the purchase of other desirable and unacquired land within the park boundaries in Tennessee, or, if deemed more advantageous, may be exchanged for such unacquired lands within the park area.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to convey to the State of Tennessee by the execution of appropriate deeds on behalf of the United States approximately 272.9 acres of land in Happy Valley and approximately 2,795.2 acres of land adjoining the north park boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, said lands having been heretofore deeded to the United States by said State for park purposes and now being found unnecessary therefor: *Provided*, That the proceeds of the sale of said land by the State of Tennessee shall be applied to the purchase of other desirable and unacquired land within the park boundaries in Tennessee, or, if deemed more advantageous, may be exchanged for such unacquired lands within the park area.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### TRANSFER OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 1133) to provide for the relinquishment by the United States of certain lands to the city of Coeur d'Alene, in the county of Kootenai, in the State of Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the United States relinquish unto the city of Coeur d'Alene, in the county of Kootenai, in the State of Idaho, all of its right, claim, or title to or the possession of all that part of the Fort Sherman Military Reserve (now abandoned) in section 14, township 50 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian, described as follows: Commencing at the southeast corner of the Fort Sherman Military Reserve (now abandoned) in section 14, township 50 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian; thence running

northwesterly in a direct line, making a northwesterly included angle of 84° 33' with the east limit of said Fort Sherman Military Reserve, a distance of 661.6 feet more or less to the boundary between lots 48 and 49 of said Fort Sherman Military Reserve and the true place of beginning; thence northerly along said boundary 531.76 feet more or less to a point distant 100 feet measured at right angles southwesterly from the center line of the main track of the Spokane, Coeur d'Alene & Palouse Railway Co.; thence angle 150° 31' to the right and running southeasterly a distance of 617.6 feet; thence angle 120° 37' to the right and running westerly 304.1 feet more or less to the true place of beginning; containing 1.88 acres more or less, situate in Kootenai County, Idaho.

#### SUSPENSION OF ACREAGE RENTAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4509) to amend the act approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the word "amended," to insert the word "further," and, on page 2, line 7, after the word "thereto," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting existing leases within the borders of the naval petroleum reserves and naval oil-shale reserves.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding thereto the following section:

"Sec. 39. In the event the Secretary of the Interior, in the interest of conservation, shall direct or shall assent to the suspension of operations and production of coal, oil, and/or gas under any lease granted under the terms of this act, any payment of acreage rental prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operations and production; and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding any such suspension period thereto: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting existing leases within the borders of the naval petroleum reserves and naval oil-shale reserves."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to further amend the act approved February 25, 1920, entitled 'An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain.'"

#### EXTENSION OF SODIUM-PROSPECTING PERMITS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4710) to amend the act approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "domain," to insert "as amended by the act approved December 11, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 1019); in line 8, after the word "section," to strike out the "13" and insert "23"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "may," to insert "in his discretion," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 431; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 181 et seq.), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," as amended by the act approved December 11, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 1019), is hereby amended by adding the following provision to section 23 thereof:

"Any prospecting permit for discovery of sodium issued under this act may in his discretion be extended by the Secretary of the Interior for a period not exceeding two years, upon a showing of satisfactory cause."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act approved February 25, 1920, as amended, entitled 'An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain.'"

#### TRANSFER OF LANDS TO ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4818) to authorize the transfer of certain lands in Bernalillo County, N. Mex., to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., which had been



reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 2, line 15, before the word "boundary," to insert the word "western," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the city of Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, State of New Mexico, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Bernalillo County, N. Mex. (being a strip of land 30 feet wide on the east, south, and west boundaries of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation at Albuquerque), described as follows:

Beginning at a point located on the western boundary of section 36, township 10 north, range 3 east, New Mexico principal meridian, said point being approximately 136.35 feet south of the northwest corner of said section 36; thence in an easterly direction along a line having a bearing of south 69° 8' and 53" east to a point located on the southern boundary line of Ridgcrest Drive Extended, said point being 30 feet east of the western boundary of section 36; thence south along a line parallel to the western boundary of section 36 and having a bearing of south 0° 12' and 54" west a distance of approximately 5,115.84 feet to a point 30 feet east of the western boundary and 30 feet north of the southern boundary of said section 36; thence east along a line parallel to the southern boundary of section 36 and having a bearing of south 89° 51' and 54" east a distance of approximately 5,245.11 feet to a point which is located 30 feet north of the southern boundary and 30 feet west of the eastern boundary of said section 36; thence north along a line parallel to the eastern boundary of section 36 and having a bearing of north 0° 23' and 25" west a distance of approximately 3,149.95 feet to a point which is located on the southern boundary of Ridgcrest Drive; thence easterly along the said boundary having a bearing south 69° 8' and 53" east a distance of approximately 32.19 feet to a point which is located on the eastern boundary of section 36; thence south along the east boundary of section 36 to the southeast corner of said section; thence west along the southern boundary of section 36 to the southwest corner of said section; thence north along the west boundary of section 36 to the point of beginning.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION, ARIZONA

The bill (S. 4735) to authorize the acceptance of relinquishments by the State of Arizona and the city of Tempe, Ariz., to certain tracts of lands granted by the act of April 7, 1930, and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to said tracts to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association was considered by the Senate, and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept a relinquishment filed by the State of Arizona for the east half northeast quarter southwest quarter section 9, township 1 north, range 4 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, and a relinquishment filed by the city of Tempe, Ariz., for all that part of the north half southeast quarter section 9, township 1 north, range 4 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona, south and west of a line parallel to and 250 feet distant from the center lines of the Phoenix-Tempe paved highway and Washington Boulevard, being more particularly described by metes and bounds, as follows, to wit:

Beginning at a point on the north boundary of the south half south half of said section 9, distant 595 feet west of the middle point of the east boundary of the southeast quarter of said section 9 and 250 feet distant from the center line of the before-mentioned Phoenix-Tempe Highway, measured at right angles thereto; thence in a northerly direction, parallel to the center line of said highway, as follows:

North 41° 5' west, 115 feet; thence along a curve to the left having a radius of 1,072.8 feet, a distance of 291.5 feet; thence north 56° 39' west, 351.8 feet to a point 250 feet distant from the center line of said Washington Boulevard, measured at right angles thereto; thence parallel to the center line of said Washington Boulevard, north 56° 39' west, 1,038.2 feet; thence along a curve to the left having a radius of 1,660.08 feet, a distance of 620 feet, more or less, to a point at intersection with north and south center line; thence south along said center line 1,260 feet, more or less, to a point at intersection with the east and west center line of the southeast quarter of said section 9; thence east along said center line 2,045 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 34 acres, more or less; excepting the east half northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 9, granted under the conditions therein prescribed to the State of Arizona and the city of Tempe, respectively, by the act of April 7, 1930 (46 Stat. 142), containing in all a total of 54 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed, upon acceptance of the relinquishments aforesaid and subject to any valid adverse claim, upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre therefor by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, to issue a patent to said association for maintenance and opera-

tion purposes for the land described in section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other mineral deposits found at any time in the lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to correct an error in the description.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out the words "excepting the east half northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 9."

Mr. HAYDEN. I may explain that the metes and bounds of the description do not include that 20 acres of land; but practically the same description is included on page 1, lines 5 and 6, of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMY TURNER

The bill (H. R. 7308) for the relief of Amy Turner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent to Amy Turner, formerly Amy Byrnes, for the lands embraced in her stock-raising homestead entry, Billings 028219, upon fulfillment of the usual requirements but without reference to her second marriage or the time of its consummation.

#### AGNES C. REDER

The bill (H. R. 9004) for the relief of Agnes C. Reder was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent to Agnes C. Reder for lands embraced in her enlarged homestead entry, Billings 029518, and her stock-raising homestead entry, Billings 029541, upon fulfillment of the usual requirements but without reference to the limitations of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

#### WILLIAM ALEXANDER KEYS

The bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of William Alexander Keys was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is authorized and directed to pay to William Alexander Keys, of Brockway, Pa., the sum of \$845 in repayment of purchase money paid by him on a portion of mineral entry 046436, Los Angeles, Calif., receipt No. 2983484, and which repayment is authorized by the provisions of the act of March 26, 1903 (35 Stat. 48), as amended by the act of December 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 366), and was recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

#### JACOB LANDRY

The bill (H. R. 2418) concerning the claim of Jacob Landry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to section 33, township 10 south, range 2 east, St. Helena meridian, Ascension Parish, La., containing 232.75 acres, as shown on a plat of survey made by August P. Pheps, deputy surveyor, approved on April 14, 1851, by R. W. Boyd, surveyor general for the district of Louisiana, and segregated thereon as the claim of Jacob Landry, be and the same are hereby, released, relinquished, and confirmed by the United States to the equitable owners of the equitable title thereto and to their respective heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely, in every respect whatever, as could be done by patents issued according to law: *Provided*, That this act shall amount only to a relinquishment of any title that the United States has, or is supposed to have, in and to any of said lands, and shall not be construed to abridge, impair, injure, prejudice, or divert in any manner any valid right, title, or interest of any person or body corporate whatever; the true intent of this act being to concede and abandon all right, title, and interest of the United States to those persons, estates, firms, or corporations who would be the equitable owners of said lands, by reasons of long continuous possession under color of title with claim of ownership, or otherwise, under the laws of Louisiana, including the laws of prescription and limitation, in the absence of the said interest, title, and estate of the United States.



## CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO. AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 406) to validate a certain conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, to Pacific States Box & Basket Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right of way in the vicinity of the town of Florin, county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the conveyance in the form of a quitclaim deed executed by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, as grantors, to the Pacific States Box & Basket Co., a corporation, as grantee, under date of October 20, 1930, and recorded in the office of the county recorder of Sacramento County, Calif., on the 3d day of November, 1930, in book No. 321, page 380, official records of said county, involving certain lands or interests therein in the vicinity of the town of Florin, county of Sacramento, State of California, and forming a part of the right of way of said Central Pacific Railway Co. granted by the Government of the United States of America by an act of Congress approved July 1, 1862, entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes" (12 Stat. L. 489), and by said act as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes,' approved July 1, 1862" (13 Stat. L. 356), is hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed with the same force and effect as if the land involved therein had been held at the time of such conveyance by the above-named grantors making the same under absolute fee-simple title: *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not diminish said right of way to a width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks of said Central Pacific Railway Co. as now established: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

## NATURALIZATION OF WOMEN BORN IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 10829) relating to the naturalization of certain women born in Hawaii was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of subdivision (b) of section 3 of the act entitled "An act relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922, as amended, a woman born in Hawaii prior to June 14, 1900, shall, if residing in the United States on the date of enactment of this act, be considered to have been a citizen of the United States at birth.

## DEPARTURE OF ALIENS FROM THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 7793) to secure the departure of certain aliens from the United States was considered by the Senate, and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 15 of the immigration act of 1924 be amended to read as follows:

"The admission to the United States of an alien excepted from the class of immigrants by clause (1) (except a Government official and his family), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 3, or declared to be a nonquota immigrant by subdivision (e) of section 4, shall be for such time as may be by regulations prescribed, and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed (including, when deemed necessary for the classes mentioned in clause (2), (3), (4), or (6) of section 3 and subdivision (e) of section 4, the giving of bond with sufficient surety, in such sum and containing such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed) to insure that, at the expiration of such time or upon failure to maintain the status under which admitted, he will depart from the United States."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to give us a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the bill is intended to tighten up the immigration law in two necessary respects.

First, it has been found that a very considerable number, several thousand, of persons have been brought to this country as servants of foreign ambassadors and ministers and have been discharged here by their employers. Their entry into the United States was perfectly legal, but their remaining here is illegal, because their diplomatic status is ended. This bill is to enable regulations to be made by the Secretary of Labor which will provide for the repatriation of those people. They have no right to stay here when their status as servants of embassies ceases; and yet, under the present system, we have no method of getting them out or calling for reports from them.

The second thing that the bill does is to take care of the young people who come here as students in American colleges and schools. They are admitted as nonquota immigrants, but it is a standing difficulty that the Immigration Bureau has to get them to go home again when they have graduated from their colleges; and we have to go through a lot of expensive deportation proceedings to get them to go back. Under this bill, the Commissioner of Immigration would have authority to require the filing of a bond by the incoming students to insure that they do go back without deportation proceedings when their tenure of study is finished.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CHICKAMAUGA-CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 9058) to authorize the Secretary of War to accept on behalf of the United States a tract or parcel of land for park purposes, to the Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, for park purposes, as a part of Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, a certain tract or parcel of land not less than 2 acres in area lying and being in the third civil district of Hamilton County, Tenn., on Signal Mountain; being the property of the town of Signal Mountain, and situated within the limits of said town, and known as Signal Mountain Park.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is empowered, within his discretion, to permit the erection on said property of any marker, monument, or ornamental design by the citizens of the town of Signal Mountain at their expense.

## PACKING OF OLEOMARGARINE AND ADULTERATED BUTTER

The bill (S. 4065) authorizing the packing of oleomargarine and adulterated butter in tin and other suitable packages, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I should like to have a statement from the Senator from Rhode Island explaining the purposes of this bill.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, the only change that this bill makes in existing law is to provide that oleomargarine and adulterated butter may be packed in tin in addition to paper containers. It is found that packing this substance in tin preserves it better than putting it in wood containers or in paper containers. The bill merely adds the word "tin" to existing law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The present law does not authorize or permit the packing in tin?

Mr. HEBERT. It does not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator, if he will yield to me, that to require it to be packed in tin perhaps will not accomplish what the Senator means. I think he means tin-plated ware, does he not? What we call a tin can is made of steel, with a mere coating of tin on it.

Mr. HEBERT. The bill reads "in tin." The word "tin" is inserted in addition to the existing law.

Mr. REED. I know; but I suggest that perhaps that will not accomplish the Senator's purpose. Would not "tin plate" be better?

Mr. HEBERT. I am not sufficiently familiar with the metal trades to know the distinction. The suggestion made to me by those who are interested in the measure was that those words be inserted. I have no objection, however, to the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.



Mr. REED. It is a matter of indifference to me; but I think they are doomed to disappointment if they provide for casing it in tin.

Mr. BLAINE. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8817) to provide for fees for entry of a publication as second-class matter, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. In behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] I ask that that bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 167) to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4082) to regulate the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases and to improve the administration of justice in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this is rather a long bill. Will not some one explain the purposes of it?

Mr. HASTINGS. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### INSPECTION OF STEAM BOILERS IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2824) to amend the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia creating the office of steam-boiler inspector for the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, line 18, after the word "unsafe," to strike out "also, he" and insert "but boilers and air tanks which are regularly inspected and found to be in a safe and insurable condition by an inspection and insurance company admitted and authorized to do business in the District of Columbia, shall be relieved from any further inspection, and the owners or users thereof from payment of the fees hereinafter provided: *Provided, however,* That each such inspection and insurance company shall, within 30 days after each such inspection, file with the inspector of steam boilers of the said District a certificate stating that the boiler or air tank so inspected has been found to be in a safe and insurable condition. Said inspector"; on page 3, line 10, after the word "located," to insert "*Provided, That* such inspection by the said inspector or his assistants shall be made at such time, not excluding Sundays or holidays, as will effect the minimum interference with the operations of the business in connection with which the boiler or air tank is used"; on the same page, line 25, after the word "inspection," to insert "herein required to be made by the inspector of steam boilers or his assistants"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "boilers" the second time it occurs, to insert "cast-iron boilers"; on the same page, line 7, after the word "Columbia," to insert "*Provided, That,* subject to the provisions of this section, when an inspection by the said inspector or his assistants is made on Sunday or a legal holiday, the fee shall be twice that fixed herein"; and on page 5, line 12, after the word "act," to insert "*Provided, That* air tanks located on street cars, busses, or other vehicles operated under the regulations of the Public Utilities Commission, shall be excluded from the provisions of this act," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia entitled "An act creating the office of steam-boiler inspector for the District of Columbia," approved June 25, 1873, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read:*

"Sec. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to appoint two or more persons of good character and competent skill, one as inspector of steam boilers and one or more as assistant inspector of steam boilers, respectively, for said District, whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended, whose tenure of office shall be discretionary with, and whose duties, except as hereinafter provided, shall be designated by, the said commissioners.

"Sec. 3. That the said inspector, or his assistants, shall make annual inspection of all steam boilers in said District, except

boilers having unassisted gravity returns to same, not in excess of 15 pounds pressure per square inch, and of all air tanks in excess of 15 pounds pressure per square inch, and shall determine by actual tests the condition of any such boiler or air tank from the standpoint of safety and fitness of operation. Said inspector or his assistants shall condemn any such boiler or air tank he may deem unsafe; but boilers and air tanks which are regularly inspected and found to be in a safe and insurable condition by an inspection and insurance company admitted and authorized to do business in the District of Columbia, shall be relieved from any further inspection, and the owners or users thereof from payment of the fees hereinafter provided: *Provided, however,* That each such inspection and insurance company shall, within 30 days after each such inspection, file with the inspector of steam boilers of the said District a certificate stating that the boiler or air tank so inspected has been found to be in a safe and insurable condition. Said inspector shall furnish the proprietor, or person in charge of any such boiler or air tank, with a certificate stating the amount of pressure per square inch such boiler or air tank is allowed to carry, which certificate shall be displayed in a conspicuous place in the room or establishment in which such boiler or air tank is located: *Provided, That* such inspection by the said inspector or his assistants shall be made at such time, not excluding Sundays or holidays, as will effect the minimum interference with the operations of the business in connection with which the boiler or air tank is used.

"Sec. 4. That said inspector or, in his absence, his assistant shall keep a record of each boiler or air tank inspected, with the name of the owner and the amount of pressure per square inch such boiler or air tank is allowed to carry, and shall forward annually to the said commissioners a copy of such record, together with a statement of all boilers and air tanks inspected and condemned, and such other information as the said commissioners may direct.

"Sec. 5. That there shall be paid to the collector of taxes of said District fees as hereinafter set forth for each inspection herein required to be made by the inspector of steam boilers or his assistants of any such boiler or air tank except such as may be owned by the said District of Columbia. Inspection fees shall be as follows: Miniature boilers, \$3; vertical fire-tube boilers, cast-iron boilers, and air tanks, \$5; horizontal fire-tube boilers, \$10; water-tube boilers, \$15; which fees shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia: *Provided, That,* subject to the provisions of this section, when an inspection by the said inspector or his assistants is made on Sunday or a legal holiday, the fee shall be twice that fixed herein.

"Sec. 6. That any person, whether as owner, proprietor, agent, engineer, or other employee, who shall be in anywise responsible for the operation of any boiler or air tank and who shall operate same after same has been condemned, unless such boiler or air tank shall have been repaired in a manner approved by the inspector or his assistants, or who shall operate any such boiler or air tank at a pressure per square inch greater than that permitted, as indicated by the certificate hereinbefore mentioned, or while feed pumps, cocks, gauges, valves, or automatic safety-control devices of the same are not in proper working condition, or before the fee for inspection provided for in section 5 hereof shall have been paid, or in violation of any regulation enacted by the Commissioners of said District of Columbia governing the operation of any such boiler or air tank, shall, upon conviction in the police court of said District, be fined in any sum not exceeding \$40 each day such violation exists, and the said commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to make all regulations which they may deem proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. That boilers or air tanks located in or upon boats or vessels operating within the territorial limits of the District of Columbia, except self-propelled and United States owned boats or vessels, shall come within the purview of this act: *Provided, That* air tanks located on street cars, busses, or other vehicles operated under the regulations of the Public Utilities Commission, shall be excluded from the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 8. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 9. That this act shall become effective on and after July 1, 1932."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 175) to provide for the early completion of river and harbor projects now or hereafter authorized and adopted by Congress, including the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, and to authorize the issuance of bonds therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### ALBERT W. GABBEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2859) validating application for entry upon public lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and



Surveys, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "Interior," to strike out "be, and he is hereby" and insert "is hereby"; in line 4, after the word "authorized," to strike out "and directed" and insert "in his discretion"; and in line 9, after the word "meridian," to strike out "and thereby validating his stock-raising homestead additional entry, Evanston land office, serial 105468," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to allow Albert W. Gabbey, of Jenny Lake, Wyo., to make an additional stock-raising homestead entry for the west half northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 7, township 44 north, range 115 west, sixth principal meridian.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FEDERAL HOME-LOAN BANKS

The bill (S. 2959) to create Federal home-loan banks, to provide for the supervision thereof, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana whether we are not to have a chance to consider this bill?

Mr. WATSON. If I can bring it up. I will say that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] had an understanding that the Philippine independence bill should come up next, acting entirely within their rights in making the program, and of course I can not and do not complain of their action. I desire to serve notice, however, that on account of the very great importance of this measure to millions of people in the United States it is a matter that is entitled to early and earnest consideration at the hands of the Senate; and I intend to ask at a very early period that we shall take it up for consideration. However, inasmuch as the arrangement has been made that the Philippine bill shall have consideration—an arrangement that I can not interfere with, and would not if I could, because it was properly made—I do not intend to press it at this immediate moment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am embarrassed by reason of the fact that I am opposed to the Philippine bill and might appear to be opposing it in this way; but I am very keenly interested in this home loan bank bill. It is of vital interest to the people of my State and I hope we may have a chance to vote upon it.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Senator will aid me in bringing it up at the proper time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED. When this order was reached on the calendar I looked for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and, not seeing him in his usual seat, I objected solely because I thought he was not here. I myself am in favor of the bill with certain amendments and intend to help the Senator in every way I can to get it up.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the Senator. It is a matter of very great consequence to this country at the present time.

Mr. REED. I think so. I do not want my action to be misinterpreted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I know of no disposition here to obstruct or prevent the consideration of the home loan discount bill. It is perfectly apparent, however, that it could not be considered under a unanimous-consent order limiting the bills to be taken up to those which are not objected to.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator is entirely right about that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. So when the Philippine bill has been disposed of there will be no difficulty about getting up the home loan discount bill.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, in connection with the Philippine bill I desire to say that I am quite confident, through various checks, that there are 78 Senators who want to vote for Philippine independence at this session of the Congress.

I know of only five positive votes against that bill. There are 13 doubtful votes. Of the 26 Democratic Senators who have gone to the Chicago convention, all are paired for this bill for a vote at this session.

I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has a constitutional question which he desires to discuss, and probably the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will again discuss his substitute. There are certain limitations that will be brought into dispute, and it ought not to require more than a day to dispose of the bill.

I want to call attention to the situation in the House. It will take me only a minute.

There are less than 65 votes out of 435 votes in the House against this bill. It has been on the Republican preferential calendar since early this session. It is the one bill that is remaining there. I think the Senate will save time if it gives us an opportunity to discuss the bill. I am quite sure it will lose time if it does not give us an opportunity to discuss the bill. Therefore I shall, so far as I have the power, oppose any attempt to remove the bill from its status as the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] sent to my office this morning an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Philippine bill, and I ask that it be printed and referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

Mr. COPELAND. I would like to say that while I am offering the amendment, I am doing so in the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

#### JULIO RODRIGUEZ ARREA

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Julio Rodriguez Arrea, a citizen of Costa Rica, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Julio Rodriguez Arrea to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point: *Provided,* That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Julio Rodriguez Arrea shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Julio Rodriguez Arrea shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in conduct and so recommended by the academic board: *Provided further,* That in the case of said Julio Rodriguez Arrea the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

#### RELIEF OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) for the relief of the State of Idaho, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$200,000 to be expended for the completion of the construction and installation of the heating plant at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the State of Idaho be, and is hereby, relieved of any obligation to replace the building on the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, Boise, Idaho, or to reimburse the United States for the amount of damage to the building destroyed by fire on January 8, 1928.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$200,000 to be expended for the completion of the construction and installation of the heating plant at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Idaho, and for other purposes."



## CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES IN WEST VIRGINIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4898) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing the State of West Virginia by and through the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia, or the successors of said commission, to acquire, purchase, construct, improve, maintain, and operate bridges across the streams and rivers within said State and/or across boundary-line streams or rivers of said State," approved March 3, 1931.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the State of West Virginia by and through the West Virginia bridge commission, or the successors of said commission, to acquire, purchase, construct, improve, maintain, and operate bridges across the streams and rivers within said State and/or across boundary-line streams or rivers of said State," approved March 3, 1931, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. The State of West Virginia, by and through the West Virginia Bridge Commission, or its successors, may unite or group all or such of said intrastate bridges into one or more separate projects for financing purposes as in its judgment shall be deemed practicable, and may also unite or group for financing purposes in any one issue of bonds such interstate bridges as the West Virginia Bridge Commission shall determine to be competitive, but no particular project or group shall be so united that any such project or group will include both interstate and intrastate bridges: *Provided, however,* That the bridges herein authorized to be acquired across the Ohio River from the city of Wheeling, W. Va., to an island in the Ohio River, constituting territory of the State of West Virginia, may be included in the same group or groups as the respective connecting bridges from such island to a point in Ohio shall be included, and when sufficient revenues shall have been determined to be available from the collection of tolls on the bridges terminating in the State of Ohio to pay interest and maintenance charges and to provide a sinking fund ample to retire the bonds at maturity as issued for the acquirement of all said bridges, the commission is authorized to make free of tolls the bridges between the city of Wheeling proper and Wheeling Island.

"If tolls are charged for the use of a bridge or bridges in a project, the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges embraced in the particular project shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed an amount sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or all of the bridges included in the particular project and their approaches under economical management, and not to exceed an amount sufficient, in addition to the foregoing, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the aggregate cost of the bridge or all of the bridges embraced in the particular project, and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not exceeding 25 years from the date of approval of this act. The tolls derived from the bridge or bridges embraced in any particular project may be continued and paid into the appropriate sinking fund until all such costs of the bridges embraced in the particular project shall have been amortized. In any event, tolls may be charged on the basis aforesaid for transit over the bridge or bridges in each project for which revenue bonds of said State are issued, and such tolls may be continued and adjusted at such rates as may be necessary to pay such bonds with interest thereon and any lawful premium for the retirement thereof before maturity, subject only to the power of the Secretary of War or other authorized Federal authority to regulate such rates."

## SALE OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4712) authorizing the sale of certain lands no longer required for public purposes in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, line 13, to strike out the words "miscellaneous receipts" and insert the words "the United States and the District of Columbia in the proportion that each paid the appropriation from which the parcels of land were acquired"; on page 3, to strike out lines 3 to 13, both inclusive, as follows:

Parcel 2. Part of lot 807, square 888, Washington, D. C., containing 2,853 square feet, more or less, southeast corner of Seventh and K Streets NE., in said city, and being part of United States Reservation No. 316-316-A.

Parcel 3. Lots 825 and 826, square 2888, Washington, D. C., containing 5,760 square feet, more or less, abutting on Hobart Place between Georgia and Sherman Avenues in said city, and being a part of the United States Reservation No. 331-331-A.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, in his discretion, for the best interests of the United States, to sell and convey, in whole or in part, the herein-

after-described lands in his custody no longer required for public purposes in the District of Columbia, for cash for such price for each parcel sold as shall be not less than the price paid therefor by the Government plus 6 per cent per annum since the date such parcel was acquired by the United States.

Sec. 2. That said director, in making any such sale, is authorized, first, to sell any such parcel of land to the owner of lands abutting the lands hereby authorized to be sold; or, secondly, to sell to the immediate former owners of any such parcel of land to be sold, provided that the price bid and payable by any owner shall be equal to the highest price bid and payable by any other bidder.

Sec. 3. That said director is further authorized to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of sale of each parcel of land sold, and shall deposit the net proceeds thereof in the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in the proportion that each paid the appropriations from which the parcels of land were acquired, and shall include in his annual report a full report of the sales hereby authorized.

Sec. 4. That the lands hereby authorized to be sold and conveyed are situate in the District of Columbia and are generally described as follows:

Parcel 1. Part of lot 188 in square 103, in Beatty and Hawkins's addition to Georgetown, now known as lot 801 in square 1273, survey book No. 91, page 363 thereof, containing 2,100 square feet, more or less, and known as Nos. 3305 and 3307 Volta Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Parcel 2. A piece of land containing 164,000 square feet, more or less, at or near Parkside Drive and Western Avenue, Rock Creek Park, Washington, D. C., and being a part of United States reservation No. 339.

Parcel 3. Lot 803, square 49, Washington, D. C., containing 1,050 square feet, more or less, at or near Twenty-second and O Streets NW., Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, in said city, and being a part of United States reservation No. 360.

Parcel 4. A piece of land containing 1,680 square feet, more or less, being a part of a large parcel south of Massachusetts Avenue, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Washington, D. C., further identified as parcel 51/3, and being a part of United States reservation No. 360.

Parcel 5. Square 4199, Washington, D. C., containing 2,900 square feet, more or less, bounded on the north by Quincy Street, on the east by Twentieth Street, on the south by Perry Street, and on the west by South Dakota Avenue, in the northeast quarter of Washington, D. C., being a part of the Taft recreation center in said city and of United States reservation No. 476.

Sec. 5. That upon any sale as hereby authorized the said director is hereby authorized to execute a proper deed of conveyance which shall contain a full legal description of the land sold, either by metes and bounds or otherwise, according to law.

Sec. 6. That all acts and parts of acts which may be inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to empower the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks to sell five parcels of land. These tracts were bought for public purposes in the District of Columbia, and were transferred to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks for care and maintenance.

These parcels are unused and unusable for public purposes, but the Government is burdened with the care and expense of maintenance.

The Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks asks enactment of the legislation. This recommendation is concurred in by the District Commissioners, who have suggested certain amendments which the committee approves.

The lands in question, through sale to private persons, would be made available for taxation and the public would be relieved of the present expense of maintenance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ENTRY IN THE MAILS OF SECOND-CLASS MATTER

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few minutes ago, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was requested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to object to it, Order of Business 886, House bill 8817, to provide for fees for entry of a publication as second-class matter, and for other purposes, was passed over. I am now informed by the Senator from New Hampshire that that was not the bill which he had in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to returning to the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.



Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I would like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I was in confusion about two bills. This is a bill which provides fees for entry of a publication as second-class matter. As the Senator knows, many publications make use of the reentry privilege; that is, they ship their periodicals by fast freight to some point far distant from the place of publication, and there they are reentered, and get the benefit of a shorter zone rate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, how much revenue will it yield?

Mr. MOSES. That it is absolutely impossible to state, but the number of publications taking advantage of the reentry privilege is increasing year by year. Inasmuch as it has been discovered that shipments of the character to which I have referred can take place so much more readily, and with so much less expense to the publishing house, the number of publications taking advantage of it has multiplied very much since the last revision of the postal rates, which was in 1928.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the department points out that it would yield about \$900,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the numerals "\$10," the committee proposes to insert the following: "*Provided*, That no fee shall be required to accompany applications for permits to mail matter without stamps affixed as metered mail," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter each application for entry of a publication as second-class matter shall be accompanied with a fee of \$100; each request for reentry of a publication as second-class matter on account of a change in title, frequency of issue, office of publication, or for other reason, and each request for additional entry of a publication as second-class matter shall be accompanied with a fee of \$10; each application for registry of a news agent shall be accompanied with a fee of \$20. Each application for a permit to mail matter without stamps affixed as provided by the act approved June 9, 1930 (46 Stat. 526; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 39, secs. 221a, 273, and 291a), section 6 of the act approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 941; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 39, sec. 291), and section 13 of the act approved May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 162; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 295), and the regulations made pursuant thereto by the Postmaster General, shall be accompanied with a fee of \$10: *Provided*, That no fee shall be required to accompany applications for permits to mail matter without stamps affixed as metered mail.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### ESTATE OF FRANKLIN D. CLARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of the estate of Franklin D. Clark, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HIGHWAY BETWEEN SAVANNA, ILL., AND SABULA, IOWA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4874) to grant a right of way or easement over lands of the United States within the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge to the Savanna-Sabula Bridge Co., a corporation, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a highway between Savanna, Ill., and Sabula, Iowa, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in order to facilitate the construction, maintenance, and operation of a highway, connected with the bridge across the Mississippi River at Savanna, Ill., authorized by section 2 of the act of Congress of June 10, 1930 (Public. No. 330, 71st Cong.), between Savanna, Ill., and Sabula, Iowa, there is hereby granted to the Savanna-Sabula Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, a right of way or easement for highway purposes not exceeding 325 feet in width over lands of the United States in section 8, township 84 north, range 7 east, fifth principal meridian, in Jackson County, Iowa, reserved or acquired for the purposes of the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge, said right of way or easement being located as shown on "Plan of bridge site and new roadway for Savanna-Sabula Bridge project, November 16, 1931," attached to and made part of a certain agreement entered into on the 23d day of December, 1931, between the said Savanna-Sabula Bridge Co. and E. C. Hotchkiss, acting superintendent Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge,

pursuant to a certain permit issued to the said Savanna-Sabula Bridge Co. by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce November 30, 1931, to construct, maintain, and operate the aforesaid highway over the aforesaid lands of the United States in the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge: *Provided*, That there is reserved to the United States in perpetuity control of all game, fur-bearing animals, wild birds, and other wild life on the right of way or easement herein granted, and such right of way or easement shall at all times be subject to regulations prescribed under authority of the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge act of June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 16, ch. 8): *Provided further*, That in consideration of the granting of this right of way or easement no toll or other charge shall be exacted by the grantee, its successors or assigns, from any of the officers and employees of the United States, including their vehicles, for traversing the aforesaid bridge, or the highway or approach thereto or the right of way or easement hereby granted, while on official duty: *And provided further*, That said right of way or easement shall not be used, except by special permission of the Secretary of Agriculture, for any purpose other than the construction, maintenance, and operation of said highway, including the fencing of said right of way and diversion of the water in the adjacent stream: *Provided further*, That the grantee shall at all times permit officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce of the United States, when in discharge of their official duties in relation to said Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge, free and unobstructed access to, through, and over said highway.

Sec. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Savanna-Sabula Bridge Co., its successors and assigns; and any corporation or person to which or to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

#### PURCHASE OF SILVER BY THE GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 3606) to authorize the purchase by the Government of American-produced silver, to provide for the issuance of silver certificates in payment therefor, to provide for the coinage of such silver, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I realize that this is a bill of considerable importance and that it probably would require longer discussion than could be had under the unanimous-consent agreement, and I do not desire to have the bill taken up under any such conditions. I myself will ask that it go over, with the notice given at the present time that I am going to move to take it up for consideration at the earliest possible moment consistent with the situation here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### KIDNAPING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 4694) to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey the purpose of this bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, it is to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia. At the present time there is no law which prevents any person from being abducted and held in the city of Washington. There is no law which covers the matter. This bill was introduced at the request of the commissioners, who are very anxious to have it passed so as to have that kind of crime provided for.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, do I understand that the bill carries the death penalty?

Mr. KEAN. I think that is at the discretion of the jury.

Mr. JOHNSON. It carries the death penalty, the Senator says, in the discretion of the jury. Of necessity I assume that it would be imposed; but does the Senator think it wise?

Mr. KEAN. It can only be imposed on the recommendation of the jury.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### FEDERAL HOME-LOAN BANKS

The bill (H. R. 12280) to create Federal home-loan banks, to provide for the supervision thereof, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.



## BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) providing for the filling of vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## PURCHASE OF GRAND CENTRAL STATION POST OFFICE

The bill (H. R. 12360) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a contract to purchase the parcel of land and the building known as the Grand Central Station Post Office and Office Building, No. 452 Lexington Avenue, in the city, county, and State of New York, for post office and other governmental purposes, and to pay the purchase price therefor on or prior to June 30, 1937, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, did anyone object to the consideration of House bill 12360?

Mr. REED. Yes; I did.

Mr. COPELAND. Has the Senator looked into that measure?

Mr. REED. I have not had a chance to look into it, but I have the impression that it calls for an expenditure greater than we can afford at the present time.

Mr. COPELAND. It does not call for any expenditure now. I would like to speak on the bill for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator talking on the bill?

Mr. REED. For the time being I withhold my objection.

Mr. BLAINE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. BLAINE. Is this Order of Business 909?

Mr. COPELAND. That is the bill I am speaking of.

Mr. BLAINE. I am going to ask that the bill shall go over.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will withhold his objection a moment, it seems that the Post Office Department has a lease on certain property in New York City over the tracks of the New York Central Railroad. That lease will expire in two years, and, for reasons which I do not understand, there has been no renewal of the lease. In the meantime the New York Central Railroad has made a contract to rent that building and the property to a private concern. This is a matter which agitates the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department, because it will necessitate finding space in a part of the city very difficult to locate property.

This post office handles all the mail from New England. It is the place where the mail is sorted out. I appeared at the hearing before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—and I am sorry the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Keyes] is not here—where the representatives of the Post Office and Treasury Departments appeared and urged that this legislation be enacted as it passed the House. It does not mean that the property would be bought at any such price as the upset figure in the bill. It would not mean that it would be bought at all, but it would permit the authorities to enter into negotiations with the owners of the property to see if the property can be purchased.

My judgment is that if we are to protect the Post Office Department and carry out the wishes of the Treasury Department in the matter, we ought to take favorable action upon the bill. Mr. Heath appeared for the Treasury, and one of the Assistant Postmasters General for the Post Office Department, and it was strongly urged that the bill be enacted.

This bill would not commit the Government to the purchase of the property, nor to any price, but it would permit the authorities of the Government to negotiate about it, and then later it would be brought here to be given consideration by the Congress as to whether the appropriation should be made.

As I have said, this does not apply to this year. The end of the lease is two or three years away, when the appro-

priation would be called for, if it is ever to be made. Yet it is important that the matter be considered now, in order that negotiations may be carried on.

This would not involve us in any way until January 1, 1934, and then, on the payment of the rent, only until a still later date. So I hope the Senators will not press the objection, and that the bill may be passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the amount stated in the bill. It is proposed to take 175,000 square feet. At the present time the highest rate of rental we are paying on any of that property is about \$2.50 a square foot. That rental applied to 175,000 square feet would mean \$425,000, approximately. That is less than 3 per cent interest on the amount proposed to be paid for this property.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will observe, the property is not to be bought for \$15,500,000, but the price shall not exceed that sum, and the price is to be a matter of negotiation between the Treasury Department and the owners of the property.

Mr. REED. How did the sum of \$15,500,000 come to be inserted in the bill?

Mr. COPELAND. I suppose they might have taken any figure, ten million, or twenty million, or whatever they might have chosen. It is valuable property, but, of course, my conviction is that the price will be far less than that amount of money. This would permit them to negotiate over the price, and to bring it back to us later.

Mr. REED. Should we give permission for so great an amount? We all know that rentals in New York City have gone down very materially. It is probable that the rental price of 1920 of \$2.50 a square foot would be considered much too high for to-day.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say to the Senator that in addition to what the Government is using in this building, it has space in other buildings for other activities?

Mr. REED. I know.

Mr. COPELAND. They are all to be brought here.

Mr. REED. I understand that they propose to take 175,000 square feet. That is stated in the committee report. It is proposed to give authority to the Post Office Department, or to the Treasury, or whoever is to buy the property, to pay up to \$15,500,000 for it. It seems to me that is terribly high, remembering always that the property is subject to the subsurface easement of the railway for the maintenance of its lines there.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that whatever price is determined upon would come back here for our consideration. There would be no final action taken.

Mr. REED. But if we authorized them to make a contract, we would consider ourselves bound to live up to it.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator can suggest any lower sum, the measure could be amended, because I am sure the price is not an important consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. Is there further objection?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I do not want to take much time of the Senate—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator speaking on this bill? It has been passed over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next bill.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not understand that objection was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator was permitted to speak for five minutes on the bill. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin addressed the Chair, the Chair asked if there was objection to the Senator speaking, and the regular order was demanded, which is equivalent to an objection. The Senator from Wisconsin can speak on the next bill for five minutes.

Mr. BLAINE. I appreciate the information. I would ask permission to speak five minutes and to discuss the calendar



number which was just passed over, so we may have in the RECORD some facts that are valuable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin to speak for five minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, in connection with this proposal I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that all of this property, as I understand it, has been valued by the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or at least the Interstate Commerce Commission has that valuation under its charge. I am also informed that the valuation which would be placed upon that property by the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission would be far less than \$15,000,000. I also have the information from parties who are familiar with the value of this property that equally valuable property with equal or more space can be purchased for less than half of \$15,500,000 as provided in the bill.

It seems to me before any action is taken upon this bill the valuation should be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is equipped for that particular purpose. As I understand the valuation has already been made by the commission. If it has not been made, it is a very simple matter for the valuation division to make the valuation.

In connection with this matter I call attention to the fact that in the city of Chicago the Government of the United States paid some \$2,000,000 more for a tract of land than the figure at which it was valued by the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore, we ought to utilize that very valuable service in protecting the Government against what seems to be a raid on the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I agree fully with the Senator that there must be negotiations and a determination of the value; but as I read the bill, it provides not to exceed a certain sum. When the Senator speaks about other property, there are not many other properties because of the importance of the railroad facilities as they are involved here. However, if the Senator persists in his objection there is no need discussing it further.

#### INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION COST OF PINS

The resolution (S. Res. 238) directing the Tariff Commission to investigate production cost of pins was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby authorized and directed to investigate for the purpose of section 336 of the tariff act of 1930 the differences in cost of production between the domestic article or articles and competitive foreign article or articles, and to report at the earliest practical date on the following items:

All pins, classified under paragraph 350 of the tariff act of 1930.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the Senate adopted the resolution (S. Res. 238) directing the Tariff Commission to investigate production cost of pins. I should like to ask some member of the Finance Committee to explain the occasion for the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I was not directly concerned in the reporting of the resolution, but I happen to know something about it because a very considerable number of factories in Connecticut are concerned in the manufacture of pins. Due to the very low prices of pins entering the domestic ports they are unable to get any protection for their products. The Senator will remember there have been more than two score similar resolutions requesting similar information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is the feature of which I am impliedly complaining. It seems the policy of the Finance Committee is to report resolutions imposing on the Tariff Commission the obligation to investigate comparative costs of production whenever such a request is pre-

sented to it. What is the total value of the pins imported into the United States during a given year? The report does not give the information, but it does state that approximately \$12,000 worth of hairpins, \$5,000 worth of safety pins, and other pins valued at \$172,000 were brought into the United States. I am wondering if the Finance Committee regards it as important to compel an investigation of this subject.

Mr. BINGHAM. I used no influence at all in the Finance Committee to have the resolution reported favorably. I merely asked them to consider it. They considered it in my absence and the resolution was ordered to be reported favorably.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The resolution has already passed, but I may move a reconsideration of the vote by which it was passed.

#### LIEUT. MORRIS SMELOW, UNITED STATES NAVY

The bill (S. 4381) authorizing the President to transfer and appoint Lieut. Morris Smellow, United States Navy, to the grade of passed assistant paymaster, with the rank of lieutenant in the Supply Corps of the United States Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to transfer and appoint Lieut. Morris Smellow, United States Navy, to the grade of passed assistant paymaster, with the rank of lieutenant, in the Supply Corps of the United States Navy, to rank next after Lieut. Edmund T. Stewart, jr., Supply Corps, and with Lieut. Charles H. Momm, of the line, as a running mate.

#### WALTER S. WEST

The bill (H. R. 1700) for the relief of Walter S. West was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged marines Walter S. West, who was a member of marine guard, U. S. S. *Marblehead*, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of the United States Marine Corps on the 14th day of January, 1899: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

#### CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR ENLISTED MEN OF NAVY

The bill (H. R. 6735) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fix the clothing allowance for enlisted men of the Navy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the money value of clothing, bedding, and outfits in kind which may be issued to enlisted men in their first enlistment in the Navy.

#### RUSSELL N. BOARDMAN AND JOHN L. POLANDO

The bill (H. R. 7939) to authorize the presentation of a distinguished-service medal to Russell N. Boardman and John L. Polando was considered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is a bill of the same sort as one we considered here last week. It is perfectly obvious that the distinguished-service medal is an improper medal to give for such an exploit. The act creating it confines its award to those who served with the American Army or Navy between the declaration of war in 1917 and to some date in 1919. I therefore move an amendment, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "service medal" and insert "flying cross."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after the word "distinguished," the Senator from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the words "service medal" and insert in lieu thereof the words "flying cross," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President is authorized to present, in the name of the Congress, a distinguished-flying cross to Russell N. Boardman, of Brookline, Mass., and John L. Polando, of Lynn, Mass., who achieved a 5,011.8-mile nonstop trans-Atlantic flight from the United States to Istanbul, Turkey.

The amendment was agreed to.



The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the presentation of a distinguished-flying cross to Russell N. Boardman and John L. Polando."

#### KIDNAPING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 906, the bill (S. 4694) to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, and for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill, with the understanding that the Senator will accept an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "determine," to strike out the semicolon and insert a period, as to strike out the remainder of the sentence in the words:

Except that in any such case the jury may add to their verdict, if it be "guilty," the words "with the death penalty," in which case the punishment shall be death by electrocution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to recurring to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. I think the matter ought to be taken up according to the view of the Senate in connection with the bill which was reported out by the Judiciary Committee on the subject of kidnaping, and amendments proposed to carry out the policy which the Senate has already established in that respect. I do not believe we can amend the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BLAINE. I will withdraw my objection for the moment.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the bill to which the Senator from Wisconsin has made reference has already been passed, signed by the President, and has become a law of the land. That bill had reference only to the kidnaping of a person and transportation of that person in interstate commerce. This bill affects only the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia at the present time it is not a crime to kidnap a person over the age of 16 years unless the person is kidnaped to be carried out of the District. This bill corrects that defect in the law and makes it an offense to kidnap any person, and would fix the maximum penalty at life imprisonment. I am going to offer an amendment to the bill striking out the death penalty. I think that will obviate the objection of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I favor the general purposes of the bill, but this bill goes far beyond the policy set forth in the bill to which the Senator has referred as having been passed and signed by the President. That applied the rule to the whole of the United States. It seems to me that we should apply the same rule to the offense of kidnaping within the District of Columbia. I understand the other bill refers to interstate commerce and all that, but the terms of the bill, the language of the all-inclusive provisions, are entirely different from the other bill as it passed the Senate. May I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that I shall be very glad to take this matter up with him and see if an amendment can be agreed upon to carry out the policy set forth in the bill which the Senate has already approved.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am afraid that if the bill is passed over at this time the probabilities are it will not be passed by the Senate at the present session. If the Senator will give a little consideration to the language used, I believe that he can find no real objection to the language used in the bill. This bill was prepared, as I understand it, by the corporation counsel here in Washington.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me call the Senator's attention to the language on page 2, after the word "reward," where it says "or any other unlawful purpose." That is a very broad provision and would subject a person to very long imprisonment, possibly to the death penalty, even when the other

unlawful purpose had nothing to do with kidnaping for the purpose of receiving a reward.

Mr. PATTERSON. It provides if he is kidnaped and held for ransom "or for any other unlawful purpose"; but if the Senator will note the language, the trial court has the discretion of fixing the punishment, and it could be fixed for as short a time as a day in jail.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The language "any other unlawful purpose" relates back to the kidnaping. It simply means that if one shall kidnap for the purpose of obtaining a ransom or for any other unlawful purpose, he shall be guilty and punished by imprisonment, and so forth. I do not see any objection to it.

Suppose, for the sake of illustration, a group of gangsters should kidnap a witness and confine or conceal him in order to prevent him from appearing and giving testimony in court. The offense would be the same as in the case of kidnaping him for a ransom. Certainly there ought to be protection to the citizen afforded against his seizure for that purpose and the concealment or confinement of him for any unlawful purpose.

Mr. PATTERSON. That was the purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think that provision in the bill is right.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. The Committee on the Judiciary very carefully considered language of a similar purport. Let me point out this situation: Assuming that there is a divorce proceeding pending and one of the parents has custody of the children, but that parent may face the possibility of having to surrender her or his own child, and should inveigle the child beyond the jurisdiction of the courts in the District of Columbia for the very purpose of preventing the taking of that child from the parent, that would be an unlawful purpose, and yet no one can conceive that Congress ought to pass a penal law providing punishment in such a case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] has expired. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. BLAINE. May I suggest to the Senator that I have no objection to the bill if the words "or for any other lawful purpose" shall be stricken out and the further amendment which has been suggested by my colleague shall be adopted?

Mr. PATTERSON. Rather than take the chance of having the legislation fail, Mr. President, I think I shall accept the proposition of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I shall be forced to object for the moment to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects to the consideration of the bill. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

#### RUSSELL N. BOARDMAN AND JOHN L. POLANDO

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed Order of Business 914, being House bill 7938, granting a medal to Russell N. Boardman and John L. Polando. In March the Senate passed a joint resolution granting medals to Wiley Post and Harold Gatty for their very remarkable flight around the world. The other House has seen fit to do nothing with that joint resolution, although the House has sent to us two or three other measures in the meantime granting medals for distinguished aviation achievements.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may recur to the bill to which I refer, in order that I may offer as an amendment to the bill the joint resolution which the Senate



passed in March, granting medals to Post and Gatty, so that that measure may be considered by the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which the Senate passed House bill 7939 and by which the amendment thereto was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move that Senate Joint Resolution 33, which the Senate passed in March, be added as an amendment to the bill which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

That the President is authorized to award, in the name of Congress, gold medals of appropriate design to Wiley Post, pilot, and Harold Gatty, navigator, in recognition of their achievement in making an airplane flight around the world in 8 days, 15 hours, and 50 minutes, thus not only eclipsing in time all previous world flights, but also by their intrepid courage, remarkable endurance, and matchless skill, materially advancing the science of aerial navigation.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the presentation of a distinguished-flying cross to Russell N. Boardman and John L. Polando, and for other purposes."

Mr. REED. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Does the bill as passed include the amendment heretofore adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

The bill (H. R. 9699) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### LEWIS A. M'DORMOTT

The bill (H. R. 3644) for the relief of Lewis A. McDormott was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Lewis A. McDormott, deceased, late of the United States Marine Corps, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged under honorable conditions from the naval service of the United States as a member of the United States Marine Corps on the 25th day of April, 1899: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

#### DAVID ALBERT ROBESON

The bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of David Albert Robeson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept for enlistment in the Navy, without regard to physical or other qualifications, David Albert Robeson, formerly chief yeoman, United States Navy and United States Fleet Naval Reserve, in the rating held by him when last discharged and to transfer him immediately to the Fleet Naval Reserve in that rating: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

#### MINNIE HOPKINS

The bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of Minnie Hopkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Minnie Hopkins, mother of Farris Carlton Hopkins, seaman first class, United States Navy, who was

killed by an explosion on the U. S. S. *Mississippi* June 12, 1924, is hereby allowed an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate Farris Carlton Hopkins was receiving at the date of his death: *Provided*, That the said Minnie Hopkins establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy the fact that she was actually dependent upon her son, the late Farris Carlton Hopkins, at the time of his death.

Sec. 2. That the payment of the amount of money allowed and authorized to be paid to the said Minnie Hopkins is authorized to be made from the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of Navy revenue."

#### ENTRY OF EXHIBITS OF ARTS, SCIENCES, ETC.

The bill (S. 4747) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition or display at a permanent exhibition or exhibitions and/or at a temporary exhibition or exhibitions of the arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, to be held at any time and from time to time by Rockefeller Center (Inc.), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, and/or by its tenants or licensees in a building or buildings to be owned by Rockefeller Center (Inc.), and to be a part of and to be known as Rockefeller Center and to be located between Fifth and Sixth Avenues and Forty-eighth and Fifty-first Streets, in the borough of Manhattan, city and State of New York, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted free of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful, at any time during or at the close of any exhibition held pursuant to this act, to sell for delivery at the close thereof any goods or property imported for and actually displayed at such exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when sold or withdrawn for consumption or used in the United States, shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal and to the requirements of the tariff laws in effect at such date; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from use, incidental handling, and exposure, the duty, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value or condition at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use: *And provided further*, That Rockefeller Center (Inc.) shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that all necessary governmental expenses incurred as a result of exhibitions authorized under this act, including salaries of customs officials in charge of imported articles, shall be paid to the Treasury of the United States by Rockefeller Center (Inc.) under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as an invitation, expressed or implied, from the Government of the United States to any foreign government, State, municipality, corporation, partnership, or individual to import any articles for the purpose of exhibition at the said exhibitions.

#### FRANK WOODEY

The bill (H. R. 1804) for the relief of Frank Woodey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to accept for reenlistment in the Navy Frank Woodey, 134-69-80, boilermaker, first class, and to immediately transfer him to the Fleet Naval Reserve in accordance with the laws existing at the time of his discharge from the naval service on the 10th day of February, 1922.

#### GUARDIANS FOR INCOMPETENT VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1308) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, by adding a new chapter relating to guardians for incompetent veterans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think this bill is of sufficient importance to call for an explanation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to carry into the Code of the District of Columbia the uniform law which has been adopted in 34 States relating to the administration of the affairs of unfortunate veterans. It relates solely to the benefits to be received by disabled veterans or to minor children of disabled veterans and does away with the very bad practice in the District of Columbia of bringing these poor fellows before juries in order to estab-



lish their mental status. Now they have to go through the humiliating process of appearing in court; the veterans themselves appear there before the public, whereas such a law, of course, should be administered by a judge and not by a jury.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the bill has the unanimous approval of the committee and is favorably reported by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to its consideration.

Mr. BLAINE. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Vermont as to the provision on page 10, lines 13 and 14, where I find this language:

That except as provided by section 1141 of this act (D. C. C., title 15, sec. 44) the probate court shall not have jurisdiction to appoint a guardian for a nonresident infant or incompetent veteran.

What are the exceptions in section 1141?

Mr. AUSTIN. That relates to ancillary guardianship, where guardians have already been appointed under the law of other States. It will be noted that this bill provides for hospitalization at the home of the veteran, and where there has been already an ancillary guardian appointed there, then this proposed law stands aside.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this bill or a similar bill was quite fully debated at a former session of the Congress; and, as I now understand, the exception contained in section 1141 merely refers to ancillary guardianships?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. And that the bill as it is now drafted meets the objections which were raised to the bill at the former session of Congress in providing that the court shall not have jurisdiction to appoint a guardian for a nonresident infant or an incompetent veteran except as to ancillary guardianship proceedings?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know what took place before the present session of Congress, not having read the Record; but I know that the latter part of the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. I think there is no objection now to the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 16, after the word "veteran," it is proposed to insert:

*Provided further,* That the court costs to be allowed under this section shall be the same as now allowed under section 1111 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, pertaining to guardians of infants.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is hereby amended by adding after chapter 31 thereof the following new chapter:

#### "CHAPTER XXXI—A

##### "UNIFORM VETERANS' GUARDIANSHIP

"Sec. 1142a. The probate court shall have jurisdiction to appoint guardians for incompetent veterans, and for minor children of disabled or deceased veterans entitled to receive benefits from the Veterans' Administration, to supervise the estates thereof, and to commit veterans to institutions under the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) As used in this section—

"The term 'person' includes a partnership, corporation, or an association;

"The term 'administration' means the Veterans' Administration or its successors;

"The terms 'estate' and 'income' shall include only moneys received by the guardian from the administration and all earnings, interest, and profits derived therefrom;

"The term 'benefits' shall mean all moneys payable by the United States through the administration;

"The term 'administrator' means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, or his successor.

"The term 'ward' means a beneficiary of the administration; and

"The term 'guardian,' as used herein, shall mean any person acting as a fiduciary for a ward.

"The term 'incompetent person' shall be one not previously adjudged insane by a court and who has been rated incompetent by the administration in accordance with law.

"(2) Whenever, pursuant to any law of the United States or regulation of the administration, the administrator requires, prior to payments of benefits, that a guardian be appointed for a ward, such appointment may be made in the manner hereinafter provided.

"(3) Except as hereinafter provided it shall be unlawful for any person to accept appointment as guardian of any ward if such proposed guardian shall at that time be acting as guardian for five wards. In any case, upon presentation of a petition by an attorney of the administration under this section alleging that a guardian is acting in a fiduciary capacity for more than five wards and requesting his discharge for that reason, the court, upon proof substantiating the petition, shall require a final accounting forthwith from such guardian and shall discharge such guardian in said case. The limitations of this section shall not apply where the guardian is a bank or trust company acting for the wards' estates only. An individual may be guardian of more than five wards if they are all members of the same family.

"(4) A petition for the appointment of a guardian may be filed in the probate court by any person who, under existing law, is entitled to priority of appointment. If there be no person so entitled, or if the person so entitled shall neglect or refuse to file such a petition within 30 days after mailing of notice by the administration to the last-known address of such person indicating the necessity for the same, a petition for such appointment may be filed in the probate court by any responsible person as next friend of such ward. The petition for appointment shall be entitled 'Petition for appointment of guardian under chapter 31-A of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended,' and shall set forth the name, residence, and date of birth of the minor or incompetent person, the names and addresses of the parents, and if a minor orphan, the names of the deceased parents with the date of death, the names and places of residence of the nearest relative or relatives, the relationship, if any, of the petitioner, and the right in which the application is made. Said petition shall also set forth that such ward is entitled to receive moneys payable by or through the administration, and shall state the amount of moneys then due and the amount of probable future payments, as well as the estimated value of any other property to which said ward is entitled, the character thereof, and where situated, and, if real estate, the value and annual rental thereof. In the case of a mentally incompetent ward the petition shall show that such ward has been rated incompetent on examination by the administration in accordance with the laws and regulations governing the administration.

"(5) Where a petition is filed for the appointment of a guardian of a minor ward a certificate of the administrator, or his representative, setting forth the age of such minor, as shown by the records of the administration, and the fact that the appointment of a guardian is a condition precedent to the payment of any moneys due the minor by the administration, shall be prima facie evidence of the necessity for such appointment.

"(6) Where a petition is filed for the appointment of a guardian of a mentally incompetent ward a certificate of the administrator, or his representative, setting forth the fact that such person has been rated incompetent by the administration on examination in accordance with the laws and regulations governing such administration, and that the appointment of a guardian is a condition precedent to the payment of any moneys due such person by the administration, shall be prima facie evidence of the necessity for such appointment.

"(7) Upon the filing of a petition for the appointment of a guardian under the provisions of this section, the court shall cause such notice to be given as provided by sections 102 and 104 of this act (D. C. C., title 24, secs. 375 and 377), in the case of a minor, or an incompetent person, respectively.

"(8) Before making an appointment under the provisions of this section, the court shall be satisfied that the guardian whose appointment is sought is a fit and proper person to be appointed. Upon the appointment being made the guardian shall execute and file an undertaking to be approved by the court in an amount not less than the sum then due and estimated to become payable during the ensuing year. The said undertaking shall be in the form and be conditioned as required of guardians appointed under chapter 31 of this act (D. C. C., title 15, ch. 3). The court shall have power from time to time to require the guardian to file an additional undertaking.

"(9) Every guardian who shall receive on account of his ward any moneys from the administration shall file with the court annually, on the anniversary date of the appointment, in addition to such other accounts as may be required by the court, a full, true, and accurate account under oath of all moneys so received by him, of all disbursements thereof, and showing the balance thereof in his hands at the date of such account and how invested. A certified copy of each of such accounts filed with the court shall be sent by the guardian to the office of the administration. The court shall follow the same procedure as to examination, notice, and approval of said accounts as pertains to other guardianship cases under its jurisdiction.

"(10) If any guardian shall fail to file any account of the moneys received by him from the administration on account of his ward within 30 days after such account is required by either the court or the administration, or shall fail to furnish the administration a copy of his accounts as required by this section, such failure shall be grounds for removal.

"(11) Compensation payable to guardians shall not exceed 5 per cent of the income of the ward during any year. In the event



of extraordinary services rendered by such guardian the court may authorize additional compensation therefor payable from the estate of the ward. No compensation shall be allowed on the corpus of an estate received from a preceding guardian. The guardian may be allowed from the estate of his ward reasonable premiums paid by him to any corporate surety upon his undertaking.

"(12) Every guardian shall invest the funds of the estate in such manner or in such securities, in which the guardian has no interest, as allowed by law and approved by the court.

"(13) A guardian shall not apply any portion of the estate of his ward for the support and maintenance of any person other than his ward, except upon order of the court.

"(14) Whenever a copy of any public record is required by the administration to be used in determining the eligibility of any person to participate in benefits made available by such administration, the official charged with the custody of such public record shall, without charge, provide the applicant for such benefits or any person acting on his behalf or the representative of such administration with a certified copy of such record.

"(15) Whenever it appears that an incompetent veteran of any war, military occupation, or expedition is eligible for hospitalization in an institution under the administration, and commitment to such institution is necessary for the proper care and treatment of such veteran, the court is hereby authorized to communicate with the administration with reference to available facilities and eligibility, and upon receipt of a certificate from the administration that there is a bed available in such institution and that the veteran is entitled to hospitalization, the court may then direct such veteran's commitment to such institution. Thereafter, such veteran, upon admission, shall be subject to the rules and regulations of such institution, and the chief officer of such institution shall be vested with the same powers as may be vested by law in the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital with reference to the retention of custody, parole, or discharge of the veteran so committed. Notice of such pending proceedings shall be furnished the person to be committed, and his right to appear and defend shall not be denied.

"(16) When a minor ward for whom a guardian has been appointed shall have attained his majority and has not been found incompetent, and when any incompetent ward has been rated competent by the administration, a certificate of the administrator, or his duly authorized representative, to that effect shall be prima facie evidence that a guardian is no longer required; and the court, upon the guardian filing a satisfactory final account, may discharge such guardian upon a petition filed for that purpose. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the ward from filing a petition for the discharge of his guardian on the ground that the ward has attained majority or is competent, or the court from acting on its own motion in such cases. If, after the probate court has taken jurisdiction of the administration of the estate of an incompetent ward, such ward should by proceedings in the equity branch be adjudicated to be of unsound mind, the case, on proper order of the probate court, shall be transferred to the equity court for administration therein in accordance with the provision and rules pertaining to the administration of estates of persons non compos mentis, so far as not inconsistent with this section. Upon the death of any minor or incompetent ward, the guardian shall forthwith file his final account, and after the approval by the court thereof shall deliver the balance as set forth in said account to the proper legal representative of the deceased ward.

"(17) This section shall be construed liberally to secure the beneficial intents and purposes thereof and shall apply to beneficiaries of the administration and their committees and guardians, including committees and guardians appointed prior to the enactment of this section: *Provided*, That except as provided by section 1141 of this act (D. C. C., title 15, sec. 44) the probate court shall not have jurisdiction to appoint a guardian for a nonresident infant or incompetent veteran: *Provided further*, That the court costs to be allowed under this section shall be the same as now allowed under section 1111 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia pertaining to guardians of infants.

"(18) The invalidity of any portion of this section shall not affect the validity of any other portion thereof which can be given effect without such invalid part.

"(19) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this section are hereby modified so far as concerns administration beneficiaries."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ACT TO INCORPORATE NATIONAL TRADE-UNIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4661) to repeal an act entitled "An act to legalize the incorporation of national trade-unions," approved June 29, 1886, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "of," to strike out "national trades-unions" and insert "National Trades Unions," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "An act to legalize the incorporation of National Trades Unions," approved June 29, 1886, be, and the same hereby is, repealed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Texas, who I see is the author of the measure, explain it?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the law which this bill is intended to repeal has been on the statute books for many years and has been taken advantage of in a manner which was not intended by the law. No actual benefit from this law has accrued to the trades-unions, but, on the contrary, some fraudulent insurance companies, which were never intended to be authorized by this law, have sprung up like mushrooms over the country in places outside the definite jurisdiction of the law, which is the District of Columbia. There has grown up a practice of incorporating under Federal statute which was never intended should take place under the law. It is apparently doing no good, but is doing much harm. The effect of the bill is to repeal the existing law and thus prevent the practices which have taken place under it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What was the original act legalizing the incorporation of trades-unions intended to accomplish?

Mr. AUSTIN. My understanding is that it was passed in an endeavor to enable men and women in the trades to form unions and corporations for the purpose of conducting their business jointly and as units to be recognized by the Federal Government; but that has not taken place. No trade-union, I understand, has ever incorporated under this law, but, on the contrary, private corporations undertaking to do business under Federal statute have sprung up. I trust the Senator from Texas will give a further explanation of the bill, if it requires further explanation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the existing law was a dead letter until fraudulent companies referred to by the Senator from Vermont took advantage of it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal an act entitled 'An act to legalize the incorporation of national trades-unions,' approved June 29, 1886."

#### LANDS AROUND BOWDOIN WELL, MONTANA

The bill (H. R. 9369) to set aside certain lands around the abandoned Bowdoin well, Montana, for recreational purposes under a permit to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the southwest quarter southeast quarter and the east half southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 35, township 32 north, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising 60 acres, are hereby withdrawn from all forms of entry and dedicated to the purpose of securing the proper use of the warm waters flowing from the abandoned Bowdoin well, and to other properly related uses.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease the said tract of land to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana, for a term of 25 years, subject to the express condition that said post shall use, without the privilege of underleasing or/and subleasing, such premises under such terms as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and that all rates for the use of said premises and its appurtenances shall be fair and reasonable and approved by him.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

HARRY MANNING LEE

The bill (H. R. 5595) for the relief of Harry Manning Lee, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged sailors, Harry Manning Lee, who served as a private, United States Marine Corps, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States



on September 5, 1918: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

#### SILVER SERVICE OF U. S. S. "MONTGOMERY"

The bill (H. R. 6444) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Alabama Society of Fine Arts the silver service presented to the United States for the U. S. S. *Montgomery* was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Alabama Society of Fine Arts, for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was presented to the United States for the U. S. S. *Montgomery* by the citizens of that State: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service: *Provided further*, That said silver service shall be subject to recall when in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy it may be of service to the Navy.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF AVIATION PILOTS IN TACTICAL UNITS

The bill (H. R. 6599) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," approved June 24, 1926, with reference to the number of enlisted pilots in the Navy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph 8 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 767; U. S. C., Supp. V., title 34, sec. 735), entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," is hereby amended to read as follows: "On and after July 1, 1932, and in time of peace, not less than 20 per cent of the total number of pilots employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps shall be enlisted men, except when the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that it is impracticable to secure that number of enlisted pilots."

#### FLORENCE NORTHCOTT HANNAS

The bill (H. R. 6860) for the relief of Florence Northcott Hannas was announced as next in order.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona desire to speak to this bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes. I do not object to the bill, but with reference to it and all other claims bills on the calendar when they are reached I wish the Secretary would be so kind as to indicate the amount of money proposed to be appropriated in each case. I think the Record should show just how much money is authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Florence Northcott Hannas, mother of Walter William Northcott, late of the United States Navy, shall be regarded as the duly designated beneficiary and dependent of the late Walter William Northcott, under the act approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 943).

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11638) to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOLIDGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### JOHN HEFFRON

The bill (H. R. 922) for the relief of John Heffron was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy John Heffron shall be held and considered to have served honorably as a cook (first class), United States Navy, for more than 90 days

during the war with Spain: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, or bounty shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act prior to its passage.

#### LIEUT. M. A. SPRENGEL

The bill (H. R. 6334) for the relief of Lieut. M. A. Sprengel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the General Accounting Office is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Lieut. M. A. Sprengel, Supply Corps, United States Navy, in the amount of \$17.36, which amount represents payments made to Lieut. C. T. Simard, United States Navy, for mileage performed under orders of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department dated May 21, 1927.

#### GEORGE W. STEELE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 6336) for the relief of George W. Steele, jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of George W. Steele, jr., captain, United States Navy, in the sum of \$1,674, representing payments made by him to five officers of the Navy in accordance with orders of the Navy Department, which payments were disallowed by the Comptroller General.

#### CAPT. CHESTER G. MAYO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6337) for the relief of Capt. Chester G. Mayo, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the appropriation "Contingent, Navy, 1932," to Capt. Chester G. Mayo, Supply Corps, United States Navy, the sum of \$115, this sum being the amount paid by the said Captain Mayo on account of floral wreaths purchased in connection with the funerals of the late Congressmen Lemuel P. Padgett, Daniel J. Riordan, and James R. Mann, and disallowed by the General Accounting Office, and which sum the said Captain Mayo has paid into the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of clearing his accounts of the disallowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES NAVAL OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of certain United States naval officers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in construing the laws governing travel and travel allowances of naval personnel the travel performed by Ensigns R. E. Van Meter, F. M. Adamson, S. C. Anderson, G. H. Deiter, Paul Foley, jr., H. J. Hiemenz, C. V. Ricketts, C. E. Weakley, M. B. Wyatt, and F. R. Duborg; Midshipmen P. L. DeVos, P. C. Evans, W. C. Ennis, D. W. Gladney, J. H. Hean, and H. M. Heiser, incident to their appearance December 7, 1929, before the State Committees of Selection for Rhodes Scholarships, under orders of the Navy Department, shall be held and considered to have been performed on public business and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to pay them travel allowances therefor from the current appropriation, "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy."

#### FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8750) relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments. The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "to," to strike out "members" and insert "and only so long as belonging to Indians"; in line 6, after the word "tribes," to strike out "of Indians" and insert "in Oklahoma"; and on page 2, line 17, to insert the following proviso:

*And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to alter or interfere with the rights of plaintiffs having suits on file for the recovery of funds in the hands and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized and empowered to approve trust agreements relating to restricted funds or other restricted property, and in the event any such trust agreement is annulled, canceled, set aside, or held to be void, the principal, together with all interest due, shall revert to the control and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.



So as to make the section read:

That all funds and other securities now held by or which may hereafter come under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, belonging to and only so long as belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma of one-half or more Indian blood, enrolled or unenrolled, are hereby declared to be restricted and shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of said Secretary until April 26, 1956, subject to expenditure in the meantime for the use and benefit of the individual Indians to whom such funds and securities belong, under such rules and regulations as said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That where the entire interest in any tract of restricted and tax-exempt land belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes is acquired by inheritance, devise, gift, or purchase, with restricted funds, by or for restricted Indians, such lands shall remain restricted and tax-exempt during the life of and as long as held by such restricted Indians, but not longer than April 26, 1956, unless the restrictions are removed in the meantime in the manner provided by law: *Provided further*, That such restricted and tax-exempt land held by anyone, acquired as herein provided, shall not exceed 160 acres: *And provided further*, That all minerals including oil and gas, produced from said land so acquired shall be subject to all State and Federal taxes as provided in section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 495): *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to alter or interfere with the rights of plaintiffs having suits on file for the recovery of funds in the hands and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized and empowered to approve trust agreements relating to restricted funds or other restricted property, and in the event any such trust agreement is annulled, canceled, set aside, or held to be void, the principal together with all interest due shall revert to the control and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma, if the policy of the bill is a wise one, whether it is right to make that exception for cases in which suits have already been brought? Would it not be wiser to make it apply to all Indian claims within the general class?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This bill applies only to members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and that exception means nothing. If the litigants have any rights, when their suits are filed their rights attach. This is only to clarify the law, to avoid any misapprehension. I hold that this amendment means nothing; but it does state that if they have suits on file, this bill shall not be construed as interfering or attempting to interfere with the rights under those suits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 3, line 14, after the word "Oklahoma," to insert "in June of 1914," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the attorneys provided for under the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. L. 312), to appear and represent any restricted member of the Five Civilized Tribes before the county courts of any county in the State of Oklahoma, or before any appellate court thereof, in any matter in which said restricted Indians may have an interest, and no conveyance of any interest in land of any full-blooded Indian heir shall be valid unless approved in open court after notice in accordance with the rules of procedure in probate matters adopted by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma in June of 1914; and said attorneys shall have the right to appeal from the decision of any county court approving the sale of any interest in land, to the district court of the district to which the county is a part.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### AIR TRANSPORT OVERSEAS SERVICES

The bill (H. R. 2681) to develop American air transport services overseas, to encourage the construction in the United States by American capital of American airships for use in foreign commerce, and to make certain provisions of the maritime law applicable to foreign commerce by airship was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Let that go over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this is an important bill, and it is noted that the Senate committee has reported a large number of amendments. I think the bill

should be given consideration; at least, the Senator reporting it should submit an explanation.

Mr. BRATTON. Let it go over, Mr. President.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico please withhold that objection a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico withhold his objection?

Mr. BRATTON. I withhold it.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that it is very important legislation. The bill has passed the House, and in view of the objection, of course, I must yield; but I should like to fix the parliamentary situation.

Order of Business 709 is a Senate bill, S. 4262. I think it would be well to have that bill indefinitely postponed, so that there will be only one bill on the subject appearing on the calendar, so that when we reach the matter next time we will have before us the House bill as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that Order of Business No. 709, Senate bill 4262, be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. McNARY. Yes. When we reached this bill on the call on Saturday objection was made to the Senate bill because of the parliamentary situation. If it goes over, I want at least to have that situation cleared up, so that we may have just the House bill as amended on the calendar; and I ask for that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to debate this bill for a few minutes? May I say to him that this is the one bill that is needed to enable us to proceed with the construction of commercial rigid dirigibles.

At the present time Germany is conducting a regular mail service with the *Graf Zeppelin* between Germany and Buenos Aires. Three or four round trips have already been made this year. There is no way in which we can proceed with the construction of commercial rigid dirigibles in this country unless we can be sure of securing a proper mail contract.

The Senator will notice that the allowance depends on the amount of mail that can be carried, the maximum allowance being for ships capable of carrying 10,000 pounds of mail. If this bill, or one very similar to it, can be passed, then we can at once proceed to the construction of one or more rigid dirigibles at Akron, in the sheds where the *Akron* itself was built, and we can begin consideration of sending mail by airship across the Pacific, which will cut down the time by more than 60 per cent.

If we do not pass something of this kind, there is no inducement whatever for anyone to run the risk of constructing a large rigid dirigible of that type for commercial uses.

Does the Senator's objection relate to the form in which the bill is?

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mail by airships or other aircraft in foreign countries. I do not think we should undertake such a thing at this time, at least without further consideration; and I shall be obliged to insist upon my objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New Mexico to say that this bill applied to planes operating in foreign countries. It does not mean that. It means planes operating in foreign commerce—that is, between this country and other countries in foreign trade.

I will say to the Senator that the bill has been amended in the Senate so as to take care of both lighter-than-air and heavier-than-air craft. It takes care of all aircraft engaged in foreign commerce. It has been, I think, minutely canvassed and examined by those interested in heavier-than-air craft as well as lighter-than-air craft, and it is satisfactory to both.

I think the bill is a very important one. I hope the Senator will eventually conclude to allow it to pass. It does not apply to operations in foreign countries at all. It applies to operations between the United States and any other country.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico maintains his objection, and the bill will be passed over.

MILDRED B. CRAWFORD

The bill (H. R. 996) for the relief of Mildred B. Crawford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mildred B. Crawford the sum of \$2,500 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries which she sustained December 4, 1924, by the revolving door (which had been condemned) at the front entrance of the post office at Staunton, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum of not exceeding \$1,000.

LIEUT. COL. H. H. KIPP, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, RETIRED

The bill (H. R. 4264) for the relief of Lieut. Col. H. H. Kipp, United States Marine Corps, retired, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieut. Col. H. H. Kipp, United States Marine Corps, retired, the sum of \$243.19. Such sum represents the amount deducted from the pay of Lieutenant Colonel Kipp for expenses incurred by the United States in transporting his wife and daughter from Mare Island, Calif., to Boston, Mass., less the cost of transportation of such dependents from the District of Columbia to Boston, Mass.

EDNA M. GILSON

The bill (H. R. 1126) for the relief of Edna M. Gilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Edna M. Gilson, postmaster at Steubenville, Ohio, in the sum of \$1,389.80, due the United States on account of the loss of postal funds resulting from larceny and embezzlement.

D. M. LEYPOLDT CO.

The bill (H. R. 8306) for the relief of D. M. Leypoldt Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of D. M. Leypoldt Co. for certain oats delivered to Fort Crook and Fort Robinson, Nebr., and to allow in full and final settlement of the said claim a sum of not to exceed \$966.39. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$966.39, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for payment of the claim.

A. L. MARSHALL

The bill (H. R. 6003) for the relief of A. L. Marshall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to A. L. Marshall, of Ruleville, Miss., which said sum was paid by him on May 12, 1930, to the United States marshal, and which sum was covered into the United States Treasury on June 26, 1930, by reason of the forfeiture of the appearance bond of Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, charged with the violation of the national prohibition act, on which appearance bond the said A. L. Marshall was a surety, and the said A. L. Marshall having subsequently, on the 9th day of February, 1931, brought the said Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, into open court, whereupon, he, the said Ben Davis, alias Jack Avent, entered a plea of guilty and was sentenced to serve a term of six months in the jail of Coahoma County, Miss., by the Delta Division of the Northern District of the United States District Court of the State of Mississippi.

GROVER CLEVELAND BALLARD

The bill (H. R. 5971) for the relief of Grover Cleveland Ballard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$246.75 to reimburse Grover Cleveland Ballard, an ex-service man of the World War, for money expended for medical and surgical service in reamputating his leg, which was shot off below the knee during the World War.

ROSAMOND B. McMANUS

The bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Rosamond B. McManus was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rosamond B. McManus the sum of \$5,000 in full settlement for all claims against the Government for the death of her husband, Howard McManus, who was killed by a Department of Commerce airplane on September 17, 1930, at Dixon, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BRENHAM, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of the First National Bank of Brenham, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem five 4¼'s United States third Liberty bonds Nos. 1163002, 1163003, 1163004, 1163005, and 1163006 of the denomination of \$1,000 each, payable to bearer, and all unpaid interest due upon coupons on each of them, in favor of the First National Bank of Brenham, Tex., without presentation of said bonds or the coupons, which have been lost, stolen, or destroyed: *Provided*, That the said bonds shall not have been previously presented for payment and that no payment shall be made hereunder for the coupons if they shall have been previously presented and paid: *Provided further*, That the said First National Bank of Brenham, Tex., shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal and interest of said bonds, and the interest payable thereon, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost, stolen, or destroyed bonds or coupons herein described.

FARMERS STATE BANK OF GEORGETOWN, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of the Farmers State Bank of Georgetown, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem two 4¼'s United States third Liberty bonds, Nos. 4529791 and 4529792, of the denomination of \$100 each, payable to bearer, and all unpaid interest due upon coupons on each of them from and after March 15, 1922, in favor of the Farmers State Bank of Georgetown, Tex., without presentation of said bonds or the coupons, which have been lost, stolen, or destroyed: *Provided*, That the said bonds shall not have been previously presented for payment and that no payment shall be made hereunder for the coupons if they shall have been previously presented and paid: *Provided further*, That the said Farmers State Bank of Georgetown, Tex., shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal and interest of said bonds, and the interest payable thereon, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost, stolen, or destroyed bonds and coupons herein described.

MRS. JOHNNIE SCHLEY GATEWOOD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5059) for the relief of Mrs. Johnnie Schley Gatewood, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Johnnie Schley Gatewood, of Columbus, Ga., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Gatewood on the 25th day of April, 1928, at Fort Benning, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents,



attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is a House bill. Mrs. Gatewood was, with a large number of people, invited out to a firing exhibition at Fort Benning. A special grandstand was constructed, and Mrs. Gatewood was placed in this grandstand by the officers in charge.

In the demonstration a shell was exploded very near the grandstand. A piece of the shell, in the shape of a bottle neck, struck Mrs. Gatewood on the right side of the face and resulted in a compound fracture of the jaw; and she has suffered a very severe physical injury.

Mrs. Gatewood was a lady of very fine health prior to this accident and injury. Since that time she has lost a great deal of weight and has continued to suffer from this wound for a number of months.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, very naturally we feel sympathy for the lady who was hurt; but on reading the report over hastily I see that she was warned in the invitation that live ammunition would be used, and battle scenes of the World War would be reenacted in a realistic manner, and all that, so she came with perfect knowledge of what was going to be done.

I am not so much concerned about her case as with regard to the general principle of our liability to all of the spectators who come to these different ordnance exhibitions. Up at Aberdeen each year the Ordnance Association give what they call an ordnance show, and thousands of guests come there. It does not seem to me that it is quite fair for the Government to be put in the position of insuring the safety of people who come to witness the explosion of dangerous projectiles. I am wondering whether it is a sound policy. I have no doubt at all about the merits of this particular case.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no doubt of the injury in this case, I will say to the Senator; and at Fort Benning the officers who had charge of the post have followed uniformly the practice of inviting the public. It is true that the statement was made in this case that live ammunition would be used; but the public is invited, and there is a particular purpose in that, because when live ammunition is being used it is very well for the officers in charge of the post to know where all of the people are congregated rather than to have people scattered about at various points of vantage so that they may view the firing. For that reason they constructed this grand stand, and this lady complied with all the rules and restrictions and placed herself in the grand stand. I think that in this particular instance the explosion of the shell probably was not intentional at the time and place where the explosion occurred. Perhaps there was some negligent handling of it.

Mr. REED. The War Department report says that there was no negligence on the part of the troops who were giving the display.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, that is true; but this particular explosion did take place very close to the grand stand.

Mr. REED. Up here in Aberdeen, as I say, they have demonstrations of every sort of weapon that we use—airplanes dropping bombs containing a whole ton of T. N. T., antiaircraft firing, firing with guns up to 14 inches, and so forth. Ought we, in fairness, to insure the safety of the thousands of visitors who come to see that display? I doubt very much whether it is wise policy.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will not object in this particular case, although the policy is a questionable one; and yet the War Department, of course, is anxious to have people see these firing exhibitions.

Mr. REED. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. In the case of Benning Field, at Columbus, I am quite satisfied that many injuries are prevented by the

regulations which are in force when live ammunition is being used in one of these exhibitions.

Mr. REED. Of course, if we let this bill go through we shall have to let all others of a similar sort go through.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know of any bill of the same kind heretofore considered; but the bill was rather carefully considered in the House.

Mr. REED. The amount allowed to this lady seems to be entirely moderate. I have no criticism to offer of that.

Mr. GEORGE. The amount is moderate.

Mr. REED. Under the circumstances, I will not object.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEX BREMER

The bill (H. R. 7411) for the relief of Alex Bremer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$700 to Alex Bremer in full settlement of all claims which the said Alex Bremer has against the Government of the United States, under the terms of sale agreement dated June 30, 1919, being the price agreed to be paid by the Government for 35 acres of land at the price of \$20 per acre.

JAMES E. FRASER

The bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of James E. Fraser was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it appears that Congress authorized an appropriation of \$35,000 for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Ericsson, and that American citizens of Scandinavian descent contributed Liberty bonds of the face value of \$25,000, making the total sum available for the construction of the memorial approximately \$60,000, and that the architect or sculptor exceeded the amount authorized, and that this claim is to reimburse him for his services.

I think there should be a justification for this bill before the Senate passes it. Necessarily, there must be a limitation imposed in such cases. Thirty-five thousand dollars was a liberal authorization, and particularly is that true in view of the fact that gifts by Scandinavian citizens swelled that amount to \$60,000. Unless some one is prepared to justify this bill, I shall have to ask that it go over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the member of the committee who reported the bill is not on the floor, but I know generally the situation.

The Senator from Arkansas has stated correctly that there was an original appropriation by Congress, and that that appropriation was to be supplemented by donations by various Scandinavian societies. Before the work was well under way the sculptor encountered long and expensive delays arising from acts of the Government itself. In the first place, I remember that there was a change required in the location of the statue, because, I think, of the erection of the Key Bridge here, and there was a long delay incident to the location of the new site of the statue.

Then, as incident to that long delay, there were very substantial expenses incurred in additional labor costs. Then at some later stage of the proceedings the material out of which the statue was to be made was changed, under the approval of the Fine Arts Commission, and instead of a cheaper material—I am not sure what it was—granite was to be substituted, and that added very substantially to the cost.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Tennessee marble was originally provided, and the change was made at the suggestion of the sculptor himself.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator is right in that, but it was with the approval of the Fine Arts Commission. I think all of the items making up this additional expense are chargeable to the Fine Arts Commission, either in originally changing or approving changes, or to other acts of the Government, which resulted in delays.

I may say that this man is one of the outstanding sculptors of the United States, and I think the work he has produced, which is now in place down near the Key Bridge, is



one of the finest things of its character in the entire world. As one member of the committee, who had no special interest in the claim but who listened to the discussion in the committee, I was fully persuaded that the sculptor ought to be paid this amount.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the advantage of imposing a limitation in a statute if those who are charged with the execution of the statute are at liberty to exceed the limitation to any amount that pleases them?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has put his finger on the weakness in this case.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I add that there has already been expended \$60,000 for this memorial, and now, in a time when we are increasing taxation and looking for new sources of revenue and talking about feeding hungry people, we are asked to recognize a claim that grew out of an express disregard of a limitation imposed by the Congress. If we are to do that, I do not know what we may not be expected to do.

Mr. WHITE. I can understand perfectly how the Senator feels about it; but the real question is whether the loss is to fall on this individual, who did the work according to specifications and under the approval of the Fine Arts Commission, whether he is to bear that burden or whether the Government is to meet these expenses in connection with an approved project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### HARRISON SIMPSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1903) for the relief of Harrison Simpson, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ESTATE OF SAMUEL SCHWARTZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2514) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Schwartz, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### W. A. BLANKENSHIP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4071) for the relief of W. A. Blankenship, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ESTATE OF JACOB D. HANSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7449) for the relief of Jacob D. Hanson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "heirs" and insert in lieu thereof "estate," so as to read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Jacob D. Hanson, the sum of \$5,000 for all damages and in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries suffered by reason of the said Jacob D. Hanson's being shot and fatally injured, without cause or justification, while traveling on a highway near Niagara Falls, N. Y., on the night of the 5th of May, 1928, by two members of the United States Coast Guard, the said members being then and there on duty as coast guardsmen and acting as such: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "For the relief of the estate of Jacob D. Hanson."

#### GENEVIEVE M. HEBERLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4230) for the relief of Genevieve M. Heberle, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "\$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Genevieve M. Heberle the sum of \$1,000 in full settlement for personal injuries sustained when she was struck and seriously injured by an automobile truck of the United States Postal Service in the city of St. Paul, Minn., on July 3, 1923: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### STEAMSHIP "W. I. RADCLIFFE"

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4591) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship *W. I. Radcliffe* against the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of Congress (H. R. 11698) approved March 2, 1929 (Private, No. 480, 70th Cong.), entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship *W. I. Radcliffe* against the United States, and for other purposes," be, and the same hereby is, amended by deleting therefrom the words "Wynstay Steamship Co. (Ltd.), a British corporation, owner," and substituting in the place and stead thereof the words "Wynstay Steamship Co., Limited, and W. I. Radcliffe Steamship Co., Limited, British corporations, owners," and that said act be further amended by deleting therefrom wherever they may appear the words "Wynstay Steamship Co. (Ltd.)" and substituting in the place and stead thereof the words "Wynstay Steamship Co., Limited, and W. I. Radcliffe Steamship Co., Limited"; and that the suit heretofore commenced in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, under the said act of March 2, 1929, may be continued in the names of Wynstay Steamship Co., Limited, and W. I. Radcliffe Steamship Co., Limited, as parties libellant.

#### NOBLE JAY HALL

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of Noble Jay Hall, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EDWARD CHRISTIANSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2606) for the relief of Edward Christianson.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what is the nature of this claim? This appears to be a very unusual bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is a bill to authorize the waiving of two sections of the compensation act of 1916 requiring notice of a claim and proof of the claim within the specified time.

It is an unusual claim. The claimant was on a lightship of the United States, and there contracted a very grievous infection, from which he suffered most acutely. It was said by the man, and apparently substantiated by the doctors, that the trouble came from the drinking of impure water. The special reason for waiving the statute fixing the time within which a claim may be filed is that for almost 13 months the man was bedridden, and for a long period of time he was practically incapacitated, much of the time he was semiconscious, and utterly unable to avail himself of any rights which he might have had under the statute. The committee thought that in those circumstances we ought to permit the claimant to go before the Claims Commission.



Mr. REED. Mr. President, would such a result follow the drinking of water?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know that I am qualified to answer that. It has never occurred in my experience, but the doctors state that that was the cause of the man's disability.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, with regard to the last statement made by the Senator from Maine, the letter from the doctor does not appear conclusively to state the cause of the illness or trouble.

Mr. WHITE. May I say to the Senator that that occasioned some discussion in the committee. It was not clearly established to the entire satisfaction of the committee that that was the cause, but we did feel that that was the precise matter which properly was the subject of determination by the commission itself rather than by us. We felt that the man's trouble was so severe, that his condition was such that he ought not to be penalized for the delay.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this claimant would have been entitled to present his claim if he had been in condition to do so?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And to have had it heard by the commission?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will not object to the consideration of the bill, under those circumstances.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ENZA A. ZELLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4233) for the relief of Enza A. Zeller.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what is the justification for extending the statute of limitations in this case?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is the case of a very serious injury happening to this claimant, who was a hostess at Fort Snelling, Minn. She was thrown from a horse and severely injured. She was taken to the medical authorities of the post; she there underwent examination; and they rather concluded that she was suffering from contusions, and that there were no fractures. X-ray pictures were taken at the post, and nothing was disclosed indicating a fracture, and she left the hospital and went about the post on a crutch.

Later the claimant employed a civilian physician, and the X-ray pictures of the civilian doctor clearly showed a fracture. Apparently, either because of the inexperience of the post doctors, or imperfections of the X-ray machine, the nature and the extent and the seriousness of the injuries were not disclosed, and it was only when a civilian examined the lady and diagnosed her case that the real severity of her injuries was disclosed.

The committee felt that, under the circumstances, because of the failure of the post medical authorities to properly diagnose the case, she ought to have her day in court.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is the Government liable if a person in its employ is thrown from a horse?

Mr. WHITE. Ordinarily, I should say not, and yet I suppose the Claims Committees of the Congress do relieve against the rigors of the law. We try to do equity, and I assume that is why these committees are set up. We felt that, without regard to the question of strict liability, this was a case where equity might result from giving this lady the rights proposed in the legislation.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MARIE E. M'GRATH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5007) for the relief of Marie E. McGrath, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RENTAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 248) to investigate rental conditions in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate,

with an amendment, on page 3, line 10, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500," so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas, despite a precipitate decline in the prices of practically all commodities throughout the United States and within the District of Columbia, there has been no appreciable decrease in rents in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, although the incomes of thousands of District residents have been seriously impaired through the present economic condition, the public of the District is paying high rents based upon inflated and fictitious values of rental properties; and

Whereas the Committee on the District of Columbia, in considering the rental situation in the District, has received charges to the effect that rents are being artificially maintained at a high level, and that, in numerous cases, rents have recently been increased, while wages of employees of apartment houses have been reduced; and

Whereas the Committee on the District of Columbia believes the health and general welfare of the people of the said District to be imperiled by the exorbitant demands of landlords, and believes also that an investigation of rental and related conditions in the said District is necessary to furnish the Senate with information to serve as a basis for such legislation as may be deemed requisite to protect the health and welfare of the public of the District: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be directed to investigate any and all conditions affecting rentals and rental properties in the District.

The committee or subcommittee shall make every effort to ascertain the facts as to the rental conditions in the District of Columbia, as to vacancies, rents, construction, and any and all other matters pertinent to the inquiry, including financing of apartment houses and dwelling houses for sale or rent in the said District. The committee or subcommittee, upon discovering in the course of its inquiry evidence of any criminal action, shall promptly communicate such evidence to the proper authorities for prosecution.

The committee or subcommittee shall make a final report of its investigation, with recommendations, to the Senate not later than December 15, 1932. For the purposes of this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to avail itself of the services of all agencies of the Federal and District Governments in the District of Columbia; to hold hearings and to sit and act at such times and places as it deems advisable; to employ such assistance as it deems necessary; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths and to take testimony, and to make expenditures to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee. The total of such expenditures shall not exceed \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### MIGRATORY-BIRD REFUGE ON WIDOWS ISLAND, ME.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1863) to authorize and direct the transfer of Widows Island, Me., by the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as a migratory-bird refuge, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to add at the end of the bill a new paragraph, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture all of Widows Island, located in latitude 44° 7' 46" north, and longitude 68° 49' 54" west, about 2¼ miles east of North Haven, Me., in Fox Island Thoroughfare, and about one-fourth mile south of Goose Rocks Light in the State of Maine, containing 12 acres more or less, together with all improvements thereon, to be maintained and administered as a migratory-bird refuge; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to remove or dispose of as surplus property any buildings thereon, which in his opinion are not necessary for said refuge uses.

Section 10 of the act of June 27, 1926 (Public, No. 345, 69th Cong.; 44 Stat. 700), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### REPORTS BY CONSIGNORS OF LIQUID FUELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4616) imposing upon consignors of liquid fuels the duty of making monthly reports in certain cases to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce, and imposing penalties, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 4, to strike out the words "the point from which shipment was made," and to



insert the words "the date and point from which shipment was made"; on line 6, after the word "transportation," to insert the words "including name of vessel, number of tank car, or license number of tank truck"; on line 21, after the word "States," to insert the words "and the Federal Government"; on page 3, to strike out lines 5 to 24, both inclusive, as follows:

The term "liquid fuels," as used in this act, means all distillates of, and condensates from, petroleum, natural gas, coal, coal tar, vegetable ferments, and other oils, including among others, gasoline, naphtha, benzol, benzine, or alcohols, which are ordinarily, practically, and commercially usable in internal-combustion engines for the generation of power, except fuel oil and gas oil: *Provided*, That petroleum naphtha, which distill, by American Society of Testing Materials Method D 86-27, or United States Bureau of Mines Method 100.13, not more than 9 per cent at 176° Fahrenheit, sold for any purpose other than use in internal-combustion engines for the generation of power, and which are not ordinarily, practically, and commercially usable in internal-combustion engines, are not included in the definition of "liquid fuels": *Provided further*, That fuel oil and gas oil used in internal-combustion engines for the generation of power to propel vehicles of any kind or character, which use the public highways, shall be included within the definition of "liquid fuels."

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The term "liquid fuels," as used in this act, shall mean and include any inflammable liquid, by whatever names such liquid may be known or sold, which is used or is practically and commercially usable, either alone or when mixed or compounded in internal-combustion engines, for the generation of power.

Sec. 5. The Director of the Bureau of Mines shall from time to time make such reasonable regulations as may be necessary to enable him to collect the desired information for the benefit of the tax-collecting agencies of the State or the Federal Government.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it shall be the duty of every consignor, within the United States, of liquid fuels to report, on or before the 20th day of each month, to the officer in charge of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce, all consignments made by such consignor, by any means whatsoever during the month immediately preceding, of liquid fuels across State lines, including the District of Columbia, on a form to be prescribed by the officer in charge of such bureau, which shall show inter alia:

- (a) The name and address of the consignor;
- (b) The date and point from which shipment was made;
- (c) The means or method of transportation, including name of vessel, number of tank car, or license number of tank truck;
- (d) The name and address of each and every consignee, including the consignor if consigned to consignor;
- (e) The destination of each and every consignment;
- (f) The quantity in gallons of each and every consignment; and
- (g) The quality or kind of liquid fuels of each and every consignment.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the officer in charge of the Bureau of Mines to assemble and record the statistical information required to be furnished in section 1, to show all consignments made into and out of the several States and the District of Columbia, and to make this record available to the taxing authorities of the several States and the Federal Government.

Sec. 3. Any consignor willfully failing or neglecting to make the report required by this act shall for each offense be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000, payable into the Treasury of the United States, or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both, together with costs of prosecution.

Sec. 4. The term "liquid fuels," as used in this act, shall mean and include any inflammable liquid, by whatever names such liquid may be known or sold, which is used or is practically and commercially usable, either alone or when mixed or compounded in internal-combustion engines, for the generation of power.

Sec. 5. The Director of the Bureau of Mines shall from time to time make such reasonable regulations as may be necessary to enable him to collect the desired information for the benefit of the tax-collecting agencies of the State or the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This appears to be a bill of considerable importance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is urged upon us by the tax commissioners of more than 36 of the States. We have not had a word of objection from any State. It will assist the State authorities in enforcing the gasoline tax law on what is now known as "bootleg" gasoline. I am sure we have all heard from home about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If that is the object of it, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, before the bill is passed I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10022) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into, we may complete consideration of Calendar No. 961, which has just been before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to complete the consideration of Calendar 961 without prejudice to the prior order. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senate continues consideration of Calendar No. 961, S. 4616.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if there is a House bill along the same line which is now pending in the House.

Mr. REED. I understand there is not; or if there is, that it is only in committee. It is desired to get this bill to the House, where early action has been promised on the Senate bill.

Mr. BLACK. I do not want to object to the passage of the bill unless it is in line with the bill which is in the House. I have had a number of telegrams and letters from Alabama with reference to a bill in line with this one. I would like to have an agreement with the Senator if the bill be passed. In so far as I am personally concerned, I shall immediately investigate, and if I find this is the measure to which objections have been made to me, I would like to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. REED. Very well; I have no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 965, Senate Resolution 177. The resolution simply authorizes the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, in a project which is being undertaken for the State of California and the Government, to go to the State of California and investigate. The resolution has been reported favorably by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It has been reported favorably by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an appropriation of \$5,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation with respect to proposed legislation providing for the ultimate utilization of the water resources of the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern Rivers, in the State of California, including irrigation and reclamation, improvement of navigation, flood control, and power development, as outlined in House Document No. 791 of the Seventy-first Congress, third



session. For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, and to employ such clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The committee or subcommittee is further authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony, and the expense attendant upon the work of the committee or subcommittee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, but shall not exceed \$5,000. Such committee or subcommittee shall make a report of the results of such investigation with recommendations to the Seventy-second Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATION FOR THE VETERANS

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, in order that the veterans may understand fully my position regarding legislation affecting them I make the following statement.

The veterans' problem has never been more serious than at the present moment and it is important that I inform them of the legislative work I have done regarding it. Many of the ex-service organizations in Nevada have, in the past few months, requested me to vote for the immediate cash payment of the balance due under adjusted-compensation certificates. When the vote on this matter came recently, I voted against it. Of the many thousands of decisions I have had to make in public life, this was the hardest.

One of the most important duties of this Congress is to check the serious unemployment problem by the prevention and elimination of the causes for it and the adoption of constructive policies and methods which will result in starting again the wheels of industry and placing men back to work.

Because of the economic depression, with millions of men and women out of employment, the serious condition of the United States Treasury, and the difficulty of raising large sums of money, it has seemed evident that this payment of so large an amount of cash would increase the severity of the depression and unemployment. Furthermore, at the time of the vote on this question the conditions were so critical in the country that I was convinced that if the adjusted compensation were to be paid now it would cause an immediate economic and financial crash that would injure the veterans and the rest of our citizens far more than the benefits that would come to them by the actual payment of the money. For this reason, I voted against the bill. However, based upon my record in connection with the payment of adjusted compensation, I wish to assure the ex-service men that I will vote for its payment as soon as I am convinced that conditions in our country will warrant it.

There are two schools of thought in Congress regarding the adjusted-compensation legislation—one portion of the membership has been and still is to-day consistently opposed to it. I belong to the other school, which has favored it and worked for it from the start and believes in it to-day. The records will show that from the beginning I have worked and voted for this adjusted-compensation legislation and have voted to override the vetoes of three Presidents on the various bills affecting it, including the one providing for the payment of 50 per cent of the adjusted compensation about two years ago. Furthermore, for the past 12 years I have consistently voted in the interests of the veterans. It was my privilege, as the records will show, to work hard for years past in the interests of the disabled veterans, not only in the matter of legislation but also to improve conditions in the Veterans' Administration.

The Nevada veterans are familiar with the fact that as a member of the Senate committee appointed in 1923 to investigate the Veterans' Bureau I strongly attacked the methods employed and was successful in helping to obtain improvements in its administration and in affording relief and more equitable treatment to thousands of ex-service men. Since then I have continued my efforts to improve conditions in the Veterans' Administration.

I want the ex-service men to know that I have been working hard to obtain the enactment of constructive legislation which will provide increased employment and bring about a return to normal conditions as quickly as possible. As

chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I have led the fight for the regular Federal aid and emergency road legislation in the face of the strong attacks by the Secretary of Agriculture and the well-organized eastern opposition. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate having charge of the appropriations for the Post Office and Treasury Departments, which include the Federal building program in nearly 300 cities and towns, I have successfully opposed the efforts that have been made for some time past to cut these appropriations in an unwise and uneconomic manner. These cuts would have forced the discharge of many thousands of employees in these departments throughout the country, besides depriving thousands of workers in the building and allied trades of employment, many of whom are ex-service men.

From the beginning I have supported the Department of the Interior in its efforts to make available the necessary funds for the Boulder Canyon project. In connection with this work, I have insisted that the ex-service men be given preference and every opportunity to qualify for and obtain employment. Mr. Leonard Blood, who is in charge of the Federal employment to Las Vegas, and himself an ex-service man, has done splendid work in securing employment for veterans. On January 31, 1932, he sent me a report which showed that out of 3,006 men employed on the Boulder Canyon project, 1,000 were ex-service men.

The Senate has just passed the emergency relief bill, which I actively supported. This bill contains many provisions for increasing the Government's activities in public works and will be a substantial factor in relieving the unemployment problem and in providing work for veterans. Among other items, this bill includes for emergency road construction \$136,000,000, to be immediately available. Of this sum, \$2,000,000 is allocated under the provisions of the Oddie-Colton Act for the construction of roads traversing the unappropriated public domain. Of this amount, Nevada will be allocated about \$400,000. The main highway bill, which I sponsored, passed the Senate on June 8, 1932, authorizing appropriations of \$300,000,000 for the years 1934 and 1935. Authorizations for appropriations for highway work must be made several years ahead so that the States can provide the necessary funds to meet the Federal allotment of funds according to the cooperative program. This main highway bill contains an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the construction of roads under the Oddie-Colton Act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, of which about \$600,000 will be allocated to Nevada and available for this year's use. This will mean a total of about \$1,000,000 of Federal funds to be expended in Nevada on the construction of roads under the Oddie-Colton Act during the year beginning July 1, 1932, without any expenditure on the part of the State. This is in addition to the funds allocated to Nevada from previous appropriations for Federal-aid highway construction for the year 1932, which amounts to \$1,392,753. The emergency relief bill also contains appropriations for Nevada for the year beginning July 1, 1932, for Federal-aid road construction of \$1,578,025; also, \$111,000 for roads in forest reserves and \$23,000 for roads in Indian reservations; which, together with the appropriations above stated, will give Nevada a total of about \$4,100,000 to be expended this year. This work will provide the veterans in Nevada with a new and enlarged field of employment.

The emergency relief bill, as it passed the Senate, also contains an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to be made immediately available for the construction of the Boulder Canyon project, which, together with the regular appropriations, will provide ample funds for the continued construction of this project with increased employment, in which veterans will participate to a large extent. Other provisions of this bill will furnish direct aid for agriculture and livestock, especially in facilitating the export movement of agricultural commodities of which this country produces a surplus. This also will be of substantial assistance to many veterans.



The legislation to which I have referred will result in furnishing employment to hundreds of thousands of veterans who should be given preference and will so improve economic conditions that all veterans will benefit.

To assist the ex-service men in obtaining every opportunity for preference in employment on Federal and State work in Nevada, I wired Governor Balzar on June 18, 1932, requesting his cooperation. With the same object in view I wrote Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Administration, and also to Hon. Ferry K. Heath, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, on the same date, requesting their cooperation in giving Nevada veterans preference in employment on all Federal buildings being constructed in this State.

Further to improve conditions, I have assisted in the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which has been highly effective in preventing failures among the railroads, banks, insurance companies, and other institutions in our country which are the largest employers. Besides saving additional hundreds of thousands of men from being thrown out of employment, this has gone a long way in saving numbers of these institutions from complete collapse, with damage and destruction to countless other industries and the financial ruin of our country. While the effects of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act have been very beneficial so far, sufficient time has not elapsed to appraise to the fullest extent the great value that this institution and its credit facilities will render in the months to come. Every veteran should make a study of this important constructive legislation in order to appreciate fully its benefits to the country in safeguarding the employment of vast numbers of veterans, and in increasing the possibilities of employment for many thousands of others.

The enactment and operation of all of these constructive public works and credit relief bills will have a vitalizing effect on the entire economic structure of the United States and a general improvement in conditions, already under way, will undoubtedly increase until normal conditions of industry and trade are restored. I look forward optimistically to this marked improvement and the early return to normal prosperity which I feel sure will be more permanent than any of the economic changes which have occurred since the armistice, in which prosperity the ex-service men will participate to the fullest extent.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10022) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The pending amendment is on page 9, line 16, where the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] proposes to strike out "\$145,000" and insert "\$50,000," under the title "Bureau of Efficiency," so as to make the sentence read:

Of which amount not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, since we have the appropriation bill now before the Senate I think it is but fair that we should notify absent Senators. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bulow	George	Jones
Austin	Capper	Goldsbrough	Kean
Barbour	Coolidge	Hale	Kendrick
Bingham	Copeland	Hastings	Keyes
Black	Couzens	Hatfield	La Follette
Blaine	Dale	Hawes	McGill
Borah	Davis	Hayden	McNary
Bratton	Dickinson	Hebert	Metcalf
Brookhart	Fletcher	Howell	Moses
Broussard	Frazier	Johnson	Norbeck

Norris	Robinson, Ark.	Smoot	Wagner
Nye	Robinson, Ind.	Stetson	Walcott
Oddie	Schall	Thomas, Idaho	Watson
Patterson	Sheppard	Townsend	White
Pittman	Shipstead	Trammell	
Reed	Shortridge	Vandenberg	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—EMERGENCY REPAIRS, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING (S. DOC. NO. 128)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, without revision, a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the Legislative Establishment, under the Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1932, in the sum of \$6,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wellsville, Allegany County, N. Y., praying for the immediate passage of the so-called Patman bill, providing for the payment of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by members of the Boro Park Workers Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the so-called Dies bill, being the bill (H. R. 12044) to provide for the exclusion and expulsion of alien communists, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. FLETCHER presented a copy of a letter by Giles J. Patterson, Esq., chairman committee on judicial administration and legal reform, Florida State Bar Association, Jacksonville, Fla., relative to the bankruptcy act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., June 16, 1932.

HON. T. M. SHACKLEFORD, JR.,

President Florida State Bar Association, Tampa, Fla.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the committee on judicial administration and legal reform, I have submitted to the members of the committee, in accordance with your request, the proposed amendments to the Federal bankruptcy act known as Senate bill 3866, H. R. 9968, and have received expressions of opinion from all members of the committee.

The judgment of the committee is unanimous that the proposed amendments as a whole are unwise and that our association should unhesitatingly oppose the passage of the same. In taking this position we do not mean to say that the present bankruptcy act could not be improved nor that all of the changes proposed are entirely without merit.

We have not considered it the duty of our committee to reconstruct the bill or to attempt to indicate what would be satisfactory, as we consider this to be the duty of the Members of Congress themselves after they have been advised of our views. While there are a number of minor objections which could be urged, there are several so drastic and fundamental in their character that we unhesitatingly condemn any act which would embody these general principles.

It is our opinion that the existing bankruptcy act is not so basically deficient as to warrant a complete structural change. Procedural changes generally are matters which should be dealt with in a conservative fashion, and not by a complete revolution of a system so long and well established as our present bankruptcy law.

The most fundamental and far-reaching change in procedure is that which involves the creation of another Federal bureau to be composed of administrators, examiners, full-time receivers, and professional trustees, all of whom shall be under the supervision and control of officials located in Washington. It should be noted that nowhere in the act is it intimated that any of these officials should be licensed attorneys, much less attorneys experienced in the handling of bankruptcy proceedings. While there may have been many abuses of the present provisions by attorneys, particularly in the populous cities of our country, where such matters can not receive very close supervision of the courts, we are convinced that such abuses do not justify taking the handling of such matters out of the hands of lawyers and placing them in the hands of inexperienced laymen, whether they be selected by civil service or purely as a matter of political influence. In this connection it should be borne in mind that the bar of this Nation is a selected group of men. The process of selection tends to eliminate men of incompetence and lacking in moral character. The mere fact that unfortunately there are many who do not measure up to the high standards for which we strive does not justify the conclusion that a group of laymen selected by Federal officeholders



will improve the standard of character of men charged with the responsibilities and duties of liquidating bankrupt assets.

Attorneys are officers of courts as well as laymen and are under a solemn oath to perform their duties justly and in accordance with law and no better method of selecting persons for this important work can be devised.

The concentration of the supervision and power in a Federal bureau of this character is, in our opinion, a vicious extension of the bureaucratic powers of the Federal Government. The administration of bankrupt assets, as a rule, is largely a local matter and can be handled by local persons familiar with the facts and circumstances relating to the same than by nonresidents, especially where the same are merely political appointees.

It may be that full-time receivers and professional trustees would tend to improve the situation in the larger communities where there is sufficient work to justify the same but, on the contrary, they might prove to be an intolerable burden in the smaller communities where the cost and expense of operation would far exceed the fees which would otherwise be allowed under the present system.

Another basic criticism of the act relates to the creation of a committee of creditors who shall have almost a complete authority over the administration of assets. While it might be possible to provide for such committee at the option of the creditors, such a committee should not be compulsory. The rights of the creditors can be better attended to by attorneys representing the same than by any committee of creditors. Our experience is that when some creditors have an opportunity to administer the estate and thereby benefit themselves it is very difficult for them to see that their operations will be detrimental to the interests of other creditors who do not have the power which would otherwise be vested in the committee as provided for under the proposed statute.

Another radical innovation is the provision for suspended discharges and the power given to trustees to supervise bankrupts during the period of suspension. It is apparent that such provisions would necessarily apply more particularly to the smaller bankrupts and to individuals. This provision is not operative unless the estate will produce a dividend of 50 cents on the dollar. We can see no reason why this extreme provision should be applied to assets merely because some official or trustee may not administer the estate with sufficient wisdom and economy to produce a dividend of 50 cents.

Another provision of the proposed act which tends to eliminate attorneys is that which authorizes the consideration of discharge without the presentation of objections by creditors. In other words, the entire granting or refusal of this is made a duty of the court acting upon the recommendations, presumably, of the new bankruptcy officials. The granting or refusal of discharges is not a matter of such public interest as to justify a refusal of a discharge merely because of the objections of such a paid official who has no direct interest in the estate, when the creditors themselves may be entirely satisfied to permit such discharge. Judges are not omniscient nor can they be expected to consider carefully the rights of the parties unless they are presented in an orderly fashion and somewhat in accord with the prevailing principles and procedure to which we have so long been accustomed.

The provision authorizing trustees to sell property without proper public notice is a very dangerous power and one which could be easily abused, especially in the hands of officials appointed for a definite period of time and subject to removal only through the slow and cumbersome political processes.

The provision authorizing assignments for the benefit of creditors and corporate reorganizations is purely cumulative. There may be opportunities where corporate reorganization could better be handled through a bankruptcy court and, so long as these provisions are not to be deemed exclusive of the equitable remedies to which creditors are entitled, may not be objectionable.

#### CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, therefore, we recommend—

1. That the Florida State Bar Association disapprove of the proposed new bankruptcy act in its present form and announce its opposition to the fundamental changes above outlined.
2. That the bar association express its confidence in the Federal bench, bar, and bankruptcy officials of this district and in their ability to administer the affairs of bankrupts without the aid and supervision of a Federal bankruptcy bureau.
3. That this association notify our Representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of this position and request them to oppose the passage of the proposed act so long as it includes any of the vicious provisions to which attention has herein been called.

GILES J. PATTERSON,  
Chairman Committee on Judicial  
Administration and Legal Reform.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9636) to authorize the Postmaster General to permit railroad and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle in lieu of service by train, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 944) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 744) for the rehabilitation of the Stanfield project, Oregon, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 945) thereon.

#### BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. VANDENBERG introduced a bill (S. 4935) granting a pension to Martha Adelaide Childs (with accompanying papers) which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COPELAND (for Mr. KING) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HAWES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7233, the Philippine independence bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### MRS. F. S. THOMAS

Mr. FRAZIER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 254), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1931, contingent fund of the Senate, to Mrs. F. S. Thomas, mother of Cyrus Thomas, late a member of the Capitol police force of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. TOWNSEND subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. BROOKHART submitted a resolution (S. Res. 255), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate the activities in all parts of the United States of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with a view to determining particularly (1) the extent to which concessions have been granted within the national parks to private enterprises, (2) the manner in which the public moneys under the control of the National Park Service have been expended, (3) the manner in which disbursements of such moneys have been made by officers and employees of the National Park Service, and (4) what methods, if any, have been employed by the National Park Service, either alone or in cooperation with other bureaus or departments of the Government, to discourage persons from making entry and residing on the public lands, and the activities of any private persons or corporations in connection therewith. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than March 4, 1933, the result of its investigations, together with recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-second Congress until the final report is submitted, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### SALARIES OF RAILWAY OFFICIALS (S. DOC. NO. 129)

On motion of Mr. COUZENS, a letter from Interstate Commerce Commissioner Joseph B. Eastman relative to salaries of officials on Class I railroads in December, 1929, and March, 1932, transmitting three documents—“(1) a summary and analysis of the returns to the questionnaire; (2) a statement showing the average annual salaries of the various



groups of salaries as of March, 1932, and list of each position reported paying more than the average; and (3) the detail of the returns," which, with the accompanying data, was ordered to be printed as a document.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION FOR RELIEF IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

On motion of Mr. BLAINE, the Committee on the District of Columbia was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 4781) authorizing an emergency appropriation for the relief of needy and distressed residents of the District of Columbia and for the temporary care of transient and homeless persons in said District.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10884) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust reimbursable debts of Indians and tribes of Indians, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOWARD, Mr. EVANS of Montana, and Mr. LEAVITT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 418) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES of Texas, Mr. FULMER, and Mr. HAUGEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11361) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to amendments of the Senate numbered 39, 62, and 69 to the said bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 22 and 135, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of R. K. Stiles & Co.;

H. R. 4594. An act to fix the rate of postage on publications mailed at the post office of entry for delivery at another post office within the postal district in which the headquarters or general business offices of the publisher are located;

H. R. 5649. An act to extend the life of "An act to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana, respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes";

H. R. 7238. An act to amend section 5 of the suits in admiralty act, approved March 9, 1920;

H. R. 8031. An act to provide for expenses of the Crow and Fort Peck Indian tribal councils and authorized delegates of such tribes;

H. R. 8548. An act authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Siuslaw National Forest, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8777. An act for the relief of J. N. Gordon;

H. R. 9306. An act to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 180), as amended;

H. R. 10161. An act amending the act of May 25, 1918, with reference to employing farmers in the Indian Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10244. An act fixing the fees and limits of indemnity for domestic registered mail based upon actual value and length of haul, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10247. An act prescribing fees and corresponding indemnities for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail of the third and fourth classes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10587. An act to provide for alternate jurors in certain criminal cases;

H. R. 10590. An act to prohibit the misuse of official insignia;

H. R. 10599. An act to fix the date when sentence of imprisonment shall begin to run, providing when the allowance to a prisoner of time for good conduct shall begin to run, and further to extend the provisions of the parole laws;

H. R. 10683. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States of a certain tract of land to the borough of Stonington, in the county of New London, in the State of Connecticut;

H. R. 11153. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 87;

H. R. 11639. An act to authorize extensions of time on oil and gas prospecting permits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11944. An act to facilitate execution of and economy in field season contracts of the Forest Service.

SUGGESTIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD copy of a letter from Mr. C. E. Boles to Hon. JOHN N. GARNER, suggesting agricultural relief legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 31, 1932.

Hon. JOHN GARNER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a former resident of Marlin, Tex., and as a citizen interested in the promotion of the general welfare of his country, may I offer for your esteemed consideration some suggestions in connection with the program which you have presented or are about to present to Congress? These suggestions, I humbly believe, if properly developed through Federal legislation, would do more than anything else to relieve the intolerable situation of unemployment, assist in liquidating frozen assets, restore public confidence, and stimulate business and industry.

What is generally needed, as pointed out by Bruce Barton in the inclosed article which appeared in the editorial section of the Sunday Star (Washington, D. C.) on May 22, 1932, is a better-balanced, less top-heavy social organization. The World War and the great expanding of industry that followed caused a great influx of our rural population into industrial and commercial centers. In 1919, 45.8 per cent of our population was urban and 54.2 per cent rural. In 1920, 51.4 per cent of our population was urban and 48.6 per cent rural, and in 1930, 56.2 per cent was urban and only 43.8 per cent rural. To bring about the needed readjustment of population between the cities and the country the following plan is offered:

1. Amend the Reconstruction Corporation act so as to authorize the corporation—

(a) To purchase farm lands in the various States wherein such lands are available at reasonable prices.

(b) To offer these lands, reserving all mineral rights, in small tracts, preferably 40, 60, or 80 acres, but not to exceed 160 acres, to such of the unemployed as have had experience in farming and desire to return to the country.

(c) Lend to the purchasers of such farms not exceeding \$1,000, to be expended for farm buildings, implements, stock, and for maintenance for one year.

2. To provide the special funds with which to purchase the farm lands and make the loans to the purchasers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, authorize the issue by the Treasury of not exceeding \$2,500,000,000 of "homestead loan" bonds.

Details for putting the plan into operation are matters of legislation, but the following suggestions are offered:

1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be authorized to make investigation through local agencies to determine what farm lands are available for sale, the character of the lands, the type of farming for which they are suitable, and the price at which they may be purchased; also, with the cooperation of relief agencies, industries, and others, to determine the approximate number of unemployed farm-trained men in industrial centers desirous of returning to the country.

2. Provision should be made for purchasing farm lands and selling them and for making loans to equip and stock the new farms through local agencies, purchase for the Reconstruction Finance



Corporation to be made only after investigation has developed the probable demand by prospective purchasers, and sale to such purchasers to be made only after investigation of their character with reference to industry and responsibility for meeting obligations.

3. The loans to purchase the farms should be payable in from 10 to 15 installments, the first installment not to be payable until from two to five years after the loan is made. The interest rate to be borne by the loans to purchase farms should not exceed the amount paid by the Government on its "homestead loan" bonds plus such amount as is necessary to provide for the expenses of administering the project.

4. Cash loans to the purchaser should be paid out only on the order of the purchaser and upon receipt by the vendor of the livestock, implements, etc., purchased, arrangements being made for placing a chattel mortgage on such livestock, etc., or for the retention by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the title to such livestock, etc., somewhat as is done in the financing of equipment for railroads. Feed for the livestock and provisions for the purchaser and his family should be supplied through local farmers or merchants and payments made direct to such vendors.

5. The indebtedness of the purchaser of a farm should be evidenced by serial notes secured by a first lien retained in the deed given the purchaser and by chattel mortgage or conditional sale agreement covering the implements, livestock, etc., purchased with the cash loans. The indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Government for the funds supplied for the project should be evidenced by collateral-trust bonds secured by the obligations received from the purchasers of the farms, and the Government's "homestead loan" bonds should be secured by the collateral-trust bonds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

With a rural population of 49,806,149 in 1910 and only 53,820,233 in 1930 and with an urban population of only 42,166,120 in 1910 and 68,954,823 in 1930, it may be accepted without investigation that there has been an unprecedented movement from the country to the city. This has been due not only to the great expansion of industry during this period, but to the attractions of city life in prosperous times.

If, as business contracted, the men who came from the country had been the first dropped, there would be less unemployment to-day, but such was not the case. The farm-trained men were often better workers than their city-bred brothers, with the consequence that the latter were often dropped while the former were retained. In 1873, as pointed out by Mr. Barton, unemployment in the cities was practically about 100 per cent, but only about one-fourth of our population was then living in the cities. Most of the unemployed in the cities at that time had come from the farms and soon drifted back, so that the unemployment situation took care of itself.

A realignment of population as between the city and the country has already been taking place, but due to the fact already mentioned that many men who are city-bred and know nothing of farming have lost their jobs while many farm-trained men have kept theirs, the realignment is not taking place fast enough and needs encouragement. Many farm-trained men who are still on their jobs in the manufacturing and commercial centers and who have taken considerable cuts in their wages and are fearful of losing their jobs, would gladly embrace the opportunity of owning a farm and of getting started in farming again.

A plan such as is outlined above would not only give the farm-trained man who is now stranded in the city an opportunity to begin life over again, but would induce many farm-trained men who are still employed to give up their jobs and return to the country, thus making room for many city-trained men now out of work.

A loan of \$2,500,000,000 would be enough to place approximately 1,000,000 men on small farms. Assuming an average family of three, this would reduce the urban population by 3,000,000, making that number of those now on charity self-supporting, and would greatly lighten the burden of relief agencies. If the plan should prove popular, there is no reason why the Government should not expand the program sufficiently to place 2,000,000 men and 6,000,000 of our present urban population on farms. When we consider the amount we spent to win the World War, surely we can afford to spend at least one-fourth of that amount for rehabilitation, especially when the entire amount to be spent, unlike that spent for the war, would eventually be returned to the Government. Moreover, as the Government has practically given away thousands of acres of public lands for homesteads there should be no hesitation in buying up lands and selling them for homesteads.

In addition to relieving unemployment, and taking men off of charity and making them self-supporting, the plan would have these further benefits:

1. It would create a demand for farm lands, which are now, as you are aware, greatly depreciated.

2. It would put into the rural districts, where buying power is at a very low ebb, at least \$2,000,000,000, a great part of which would quickly find its way to the ordinary channels of trade and commerce.

3. Farmers indebted to banks now in difficulty would have a market for part of their farm lands, through the sale of which they could liquidate their loans.

4. Many rural banks that have been closed within the last two years could liquidate part of their frozen assets represented by loans on farm lands and thus be enabled to increase distribution to their depositors.

5. Equipping and stocking 1,000,000 new farm units would require at least 1,000,000 head of mules or horses, 1,000,000 milch

cows, 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 head of hogs, 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 fowls, a large number of farm implements, and great quantities of feed and provisions. The demand for all these things would be stimulated, enabling farmers to convert a part of their livestock and crops into cash at much better prices than they are receiving now, and giving employment directly and indirectly to many men in manufacturing centers. The provision of cottages and farm buildings for the new farms would stimulate the demand for building material.

6. The loans would all be productive, self-liquidating loans, and the Government would be well secured because of the low price at which farms may now be purchased.

7. Because of the nature of the security back of the homestead-loan bonds, these bonds would have a special appeal to hoarders who are afraid of ordinary Government loans, and the flotation of the Government loan would call out of hiding millions of dollars that have been withdrawn from circulation.

It may be objected that, because of the present overproduction of farm products, the farm population is already too large and that increasing the farm population would add to the depression of the market for such products. This, however, would not be the case. The plan calls for the sale of small tracts large enough only to support a man and his family and to give him only enough surplus to buy his clothing, keep up his interest, and eventually pay the principal of his loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. During the first two or three years this additional surplus would be so small that it would have little, if any, effect on the prices of farm products. In the meantime the stimulation to trade and industries, because of putting into circulation \$2,500,000,000, would be reflected in increasing demand and rising prices for farm products, and other remedies would be worked out for eliminating overproduction, which, it would seem, is a thing that can be reached only by taxation or by cooperation and organization on the part of the producers themselves.

In this connection may I also suggest that because of the difficulties of bringing about cooperation even by such a plan as is now before Congress for the taxation of farm products in the hands of the purchasers and the return of this tax to such of the producers as will agree to curtail production (an expedient of doubtful constitutionality), a better plan would seem to be for the States to decrease the direct tax on farm lands and place a tax on cultivated acreage, exempting from the tax so many acres of each product for each man employed in the production thereof, and taxing all acreage above that exempted at a gradually increasing scale that would become confiscatory for the products of such acreage as would result in overproduction. The Farm Board should be employed as the agency for bringing about better cooperation in the matter of farm production and for studying the possibilities of such a State tax as is suggested.

The greatest benefit to be derived from the plan above outlined would be the relieving of unemployment, the making of a great number of the unemployed self-supporting and self-respecting citizens, and the releasing of millions of dollars that are now being hoarded throughout the country.

As Mr. Barton says in his article: "Certainly many men are now saying to themselves, 'I should much rather have a roof over my head and potatoes and cabbages in the cellar than to be an ex Vice President sitting on a cold curbstone.'"

C. E. BOLES.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not see either the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary] in the Chamber. There is a resolution on the calendar which was pretty well disposed of some days ago, Calendar No. 640, the resolution (S. Res. 174) for an investigation of campaign expenditures of presidential and senatorial candidates in 1932. A motion was made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Blaine] to reconsider the vote by which a certain amendment was agreed to. I think it would take only a moment to dispose of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Neely] is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will withdraw the request for the present. I thought he was here.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah is waiting for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], may I state that he said to me that he is in favor of passing the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And so is the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary].

Mr. NORRIS. There is no need to wait for the Senator from Indiana to be present.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let us take it up and dispose of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the resolution was reached on the call of the calendar the other day the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] and the Senator from



West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] objected. It seems scarcely fair to take it up in their absence. I will try to get them into the Chamber.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from West Virginia is out of the city and probably will not be back for some days.

Mr. REED. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from West Virginia merely moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to; but of course if the Senator from Pennsylvania is not ready to take it up, I shall not insist.

Mr. REED. In behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire I shall have to object.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have been trying to get action on the resolution for 60 days. There has been an agreement with both the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], but we get no action. I give notice now that later in the day I shall ask for its consideration.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10022) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The pending amendment is on page 9, line 16, under the heading of "Bureau of Efficiency," where the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] moved to strike out "\$145,000" in the committee amendment and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

Of which amount not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on Saturday an amendment was offered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], to be found on page 13965 of the RECORD. The amendment reads as follows:

The Federal Trade Commission is hereafter prohibited from making investigations ordered by the legislative branch of the Government until the appropriations therefor are made available specifically for each such investigation authorized.

It will be remembered by Senators that the items concerning the Federal Trade Commission had been passed over and many Senators left the Chamber with the understanding that controversial matters were not to be taken up. At the time the amendment was offered the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] had this to say:

Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who are interested in that particular amendment in regard to the Federal Trade Commission who are not in the Chamber at the present time.

To which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] replied:

This amendment has not anything to do with the items which they have in mind. This is simply a clarifying amendment. We have passed over all of the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission at the request of these Senators.

The Vice President then put the question, and the amendment was agreed to. In view of that situation, I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote whereby the amendment on page 22, after line 6, was agreed to, being the amendment to which I have just adverted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment may be stated again.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will read it again: On page 22, after line 6, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] offered the following amendment:

The Federal Trade Commission is hereafter prohibited from making investigations ordered by the legislative branch of the Government until the appropriations therefor are made available specifically for each such investigation authorized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that that amendment was favored by every member of the committee, Republican as well as Democrat. I do not know why it should not stand as it is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have asked unanimous consent in order to save time.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to having the amendment reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senate my contention with relation to the effect of this amendment on the existing law. The original Federal Trade Commission act authorizes and directs the commission to make investigations which are requested or called for by either or both branches of Congress. It is perfectly obvious that the effect of this amendment is not to limit the appropriations contained in the pending bill but changes the entire substantive procedure for the conduct of investigations requested by either branch or both branches of Congress upon questions which come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. It is upon that statement of facts, which I do not think can be successfully contradicted, that I wish to make the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation and can not be considered in connection with this appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What does the Senator from Utah have to say on that subject?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the amendment was adopted by a unanimous vote of the members of the Appropriations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The word "hereafter" is in the amendment, which makes it a law, and therefore it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask, Mr. President, that the word "hereafter" may be stricken out of the amendment. Then it will not fall within the rule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I contend the amendment is still subject to a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not concede that the elimination of the word "hereafter" would make the amendment in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not concede the point, either.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the Chair decide the question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Some of us want to say a word about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is out of order, even with the word "hereafter" stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it is subject to a point of order in the condition it is now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. The Chair is advised that there are amendments which have been passed over. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment passed over is on page 21, line 1, to strike out "\$399,360" and insert "\$350,000."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, representatives of the Radio Commission saw me this morning and suggested that if we would provide an appropriation of \$366,000 instead of \$399,360, and then in line 5 strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$16,000," they thought they could get along. If there is no objection, I will ask to offer those amendments to the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 1, after the word "expenses," it is proposed to strike out "\$399,360" and insert "\$366,000."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, according to the RECORD that amendment was adopted the other day.



Mr. SMOOT. That is true, and I desire to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote whereby it was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not understand why the action of the committee in reducing the appropriation to \$350,000 should now be changed and that it should be increased by \$16,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I have stated that representatives of the Radio Commission came to me and suggested that what I have proposed would be the best way out.

Mr. BINGHAM. Of course, they want more money, but I am surprised that the Senator from Utah should propose to increase the appropriation beyond what the committee recommended merely because the commission say they should like to have more money.

Mr. SMOOT. I tried to meet the situation by increasing the appropriation in one place and cutting it in another. If there is any objection, I will not ask that any change be made at all but will ask that the amendment may be agreed to as reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment in line 1 has already been agreed to, and also the amendment in line 2. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 5, after the word "Commission," it is proposed to strike out "\$32,000" and insert "\$20,000."

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that that item remain just as it is, if there is not going to be any change in the previous items.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 21, line 6, after the word "Commission," to strike out "\$431,316" and insert "\$370,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the subhead "Federal Trade Commission," on page 21, line 20, after the word "papers," it is proposed to strike out "not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If that is to be taken up now, I wish to propose an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Which amendment does the Senator from Utah desire to have considered first?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have considered first the amendment on page 22, under the heading "General Accounting Office."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be reported.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the Senator is passing over the Federal Trade Commission item, then?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. There is only one amendment there.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to taking up the provisions affecting the General Accounting Office, if the Senator prefers that course, but the provisions regarding the Federal Trade Commission were passed over, and they also will have to be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the amendments be taken up in their order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I should like.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask whether or not an order has been entered to consider committee amendments first?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 20, after the word "newspapers," it is proposed to strike out "not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee why, in view of the striking out of the \$200 for newspaper clippings, the total is not reduced by \$200?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we want to save that \$200.

Mr. BINGHAM. If we save \$200 by striking out the item, why not save it in the total?

Mr. SMOOT. The language proposed to be stricken out is a limitation. It reads "not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings."

Mr. BINGHAM. It certainly was not the object of the committee to permit the commission to spend \$200 for newspaper clippings, if that is what the Senator means by striking out those words. My understanding of the amendment of the committee was that what the committee felt was that \$200 for newspaper clippings was wasted. So why not cut \$200 out of the total, and make it clear that the commission are not to expend that amount for that purpose?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment is not in order to be considered now; but, in order that the Senator in charge of the bill may be advised of it, I ask to have read the amendment which it is my purpose to offer when the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 22, after the word "act," it is proposed to strike out "\$1,236,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,536,500."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I may say, Mr. President, that this proposal is to increase the allowance for the Federal Trade Commission by \$300,000; and if the amendment should be agreed to, it will be necessary to change certain other totals in the paragraph. Does the Senator from Utah desire to take up this amendment now?

Mr. SMOOT. I think we had better get through with the committee amendments, and then consider individual amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 20, after the word "newspapers," it is proposed to strike out "not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish to propose an inquiry as to the parliamentary situation. I understood that the committee amendments had all been considered in this bill except those which had been passed over. Now we are simply going back and considering amendments which had been passed over at the request of Senators. That being true, why is it not in order to offer amendments to the committee amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to which the Chair presumes the Senator from Florida has reference has not yet been reached.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I say also that the amendment offered by me does not pertain to a committee amendment, but pertains to the House text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which has been stated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Which amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment again be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 20, after the word "newspapers," to strike out "not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 11, under the heading "General Accounting Office," after the name "Columbia," it is proposed to strike out "\$4,052,620; in all \$4,062,620" and insert "\$3,500,000; in all, \$3,510,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to resist the committee amendment cutting the appropriation for the General Accounting Office \$552,620.

I may say that the House committee held hearings on this item for the General Accounting Office and after having gone into it very thoroughly recommended the sum of \$4,062,620.

The cut recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee was made without any hearing, without any repre-



sentative, as I understand, of the General Accounting Office having been heard, and it is my information that a cut of this nature will very seriously cripple the work of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, it seems to me the Senate should hesitate before it proposes to cut a half million dollars from the appropriation for the work of the General Accounting Office. It is a most important work in the Federal Government, and at a time like this it is exceedingly desirable that the work of that office should be maintained.

I am advised that the Comptroller General has written a letter to the chairman of the committee. In the letter he states he feels it to be his duty to inform the Congress that if the action recommended by the Senate committee shall be agreed to, it will be impossible for him properly to discharge the responsibilities which Congress has fixed upon him by statute.

Without any question, the adoption of this amendment will result in delay in the Comptroller General's office in the adjustment of collections and overpayments which can not be made unless they are, under the statute, approved by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not feel it is proper to take the time of the Senator from Wisconsin, but it may save the time of the Senate to say now that it seems to me that it is a very questionable policy to impair the efficiency in any degree of the General Accounting Office. That is one bureau in the Government that must function and must function efficiently. If we reduce the number of employees there or otherwise cut down the activities of the bureau, it will probably cause much greater loss to the Government by reason of the confusion, the delay, and the uncertainty regarding accounts. This, in my judgment, is one place where there must be the highest possible degree of promptness and efficiency.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree exactly with what the Senator says. I have always been partial to the General Accounting Office, knowing the work that they have done; but the committee took the position that they were instructed to take 10 per cent off the bill, and they are doing the best they can. So far as I am personally concerned, I want to say that I would rather cut out this amount somewhere else than to cut it out of this item.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the cut will have to come somewhere else and that the Senator will save time by taking a vote at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin on this amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no desire to prolong the debate if the amendment is to be rejected. I appreciate the reinforcement of my statement made by the Senator from Arkansas. I was about to go on and point out that the departments and independent establishments will be delayed because they will not be able to get decisions from the General Accounting Office as to how the money appropriated may be spent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Another thing: The General Accounting Office really saves the Government a great deal of money by eliminating unauthorized accounts.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Precisely. I make the point also that in view of the record of the General Accounting Office made in saving money for the Government, I think we can trust General McCarl's judgment. He would not resist a cut at a time like this unless he felt that it would absolutely make it impossible for him to discharge the statutory obligations and functions of his office.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, instead of that amount being \$3,510,000, I should like to suggest adding \$300,000 to it, making it \$3,810,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; if the Senator is going to insist on this amendment, I wish to debate it further, because General McCarl has stated to the Senator under his responsibility as the chief of his office that he can not properly discharge the functions of that office with the cut provided, and that the amount contained in the bill and

recommended by the House committee, I repeat, after careful investigation and after thorough hearings, is the minimum amount upon which he can discharge the responsibilities that are imposed upon him by the Congress and by the statutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to read General McCarl's letter so that it will be in the RECORD at least.

He says:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, June 13, 1932.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel it my duty to advise the Congress through your committee that in the event the 1933 appropriation for personal services in the General Accounting Office should be reduced to the full extent recommended by your committee, to wit, \$552,620, it will prove a very serious matter—so serious that I feel sure the committee would have hesitated to recommend such a drastic cut had it been possessed of the facts.

It is not believed the Congress wishes or can afford to relax to a danger point accounting control over the uses of public moneys, especially in these times when every dollar should be employed not only honestly and in accordance with law but to the best possible advantage, yet such must be the effect of any cut so drastic as to provide an insufficient force to do the essential work.

The General Accounting Office has no appropriation of consequence but for personal services and to be helpful and effective its work must be kept current. It is not a spending agency as are the departments and most of the establishments of the executive branch and, in consequence, has no spending program that might profitably be deferred to a more opportune time, but rather it is an accounting and collecting agency engaged in following the uses of public moneys and recovering unlawful payments therefrom.

Applying to the proposed reduction the most severe pay cut proposed in the economy bill, there will still be necessary a very great curtailment in personal services—to be accomplished through discharging employees or forcing such extended furloughs as to have a like effect. With a present force hardly adequate to care for the work now entrusted to the establishment by law, and with new and serious responsibilities added by recent legislation and measures nearing enactment, you can readily understand what it will mean in delaying and disrupting the accounting work to lose the services of so many trained employees.

The officers and employees of the General Accounting Office will loyally and willingly accept such temporary salary adjustment as the Congress in its wisdom determines Government officials and employees should contribute toward a balancing of the Federal Budget; and our appropriation for personal services might properly be reduced as passed by the House of Representatives in the amount of such salary adjustments, but to go beyond such point will mean not only salary cuts but the loss of valuable and much-needed employees.

While the greatest value of a prompt and thorough audit of public expenditures is the wholesome effect of the knowledge that it is to occur—that each expenditure is to be checked and scrutinized by an independent agency—and the value in this respect can not be measured in dollars, it is to be remembered that since its organization on July 1, 1921, the General Accounting Office has actually recovered in unlawful expenditures more than the entire cost of its maintenance and operation, so it is not one of the agencies responsible for the present deficit.

Economies must be accomplished, and the General Accounting Office wishes to do its full share; but to require such a reduction in personal services as to render it impossible to do the work as required by law, and thus relax accounting control, may prove in the end a most expensive luxury.

Very respectfully,

J. R. McCARL,  
Comptroller General of the United States.

On that letter alone I think there ought to be a compromise in this matter. He does not say that there can not be any reductions made; and it seems to me that we ought to save every dollar we can from every source that we can, and even then we will be away short of the necessary amount of saving. We have not in the appropriation bills now saved the amount that we must save in order to pay the expenses of the Government for the coming fiscal year.

If we give the Comptroller General \$300,000 more, then, with what is left between that and the five hundred and odd thousand dollars, he could get along. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is just as much interested in cutting expenses wherever they can be cut as I am, or as anybody else in this body is. For that reason it seems to me that it would be perfectly fair to make some kind of a compromise on the amount.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.



Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to be recognized. I understand that the Senator from Utah has yielded the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah propose an amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I thought it would be very much better if we could agree and have the matter so that it would be satisfactory to all of us to add \$300,000 to this amount, making it \$3,810,000 instead of \$3,510,000, and I am going to ask the Senator if that is not a fair proposition.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, every line the Senator from Utah has read from the Comptroller General is just as telling an argument against the so-called compromise that he proposes as it is against the action of the committee itself. General McCarl states that the office can not properly function, it can not properly discharge the obligations imposed by law, with any less amount than that provided by the House after careful consideration. May I point out, as General McCarl does in his letter, that the expenditures of this office are largely for personnel. The Senator has no more justification for the amount which he now proposes than the Senate committee had for the more drastic cut which it recommended. He simply picks that figure out of thin air.

The point is that if we curtail an office whose expenditures are largely for personnel we obviously disrupt the service and the functioning of that office. In times such as these, when we are making these extraordinary expenditures for one purpose and another, there never was a greater need for the maintenance of the efficiency and the service and the organization than there is at this time in the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, it will delay the work of this office if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah is agreed to; and in view of the fact that a man as careful in his administration as is General McCarl has upon his own responsibility informed the Senator from Utah, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of this bill, that any further reduction below the amount carried by the House will result in delay in the discharge of the duties imposed upon that office, will make necessary a reduction in personnel which is the chief expenditure of money by that office. We must remember also that any further economy legislation which may pass will also require a further reduction of force in the General Accounting Office. I hope the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah will be rejected, and then I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may know just exactly how matters will stand if the committee amendment is rejected, I will state that then, of course, the General Accounting Office will have exactly the same amount that they had last year. It is the only institution I know of that is asking now for exactly what it had the year before. If that is the feeling of the Senate, I have not anything further to say.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the House had full hearings on the subject, and reduced the amount estimated for to the figure carried in the House bill. The Senate committee, without going into the matter at all, just made an arbitrary cut of about 10 per cent in the House figure. As I have already stated, the service that this bureau renders is of such an essential character in connection with Government accounting that it is poor economy—in fact, it is not economy—to impair its efficiency by denying it the force and the instrumentalities necessary to do its work according to the highest standard that has prevailed there in the past.

I believe the Senator from Utah is entirely justified in receding from the committee amendment. It, of course, will require a good deal of time if that is not done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 20, it is proposed to insert "including one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Utah? I was called from the Chamber a moment ago when the radio item was called up. Upon inquiry, I find that no explanation was made of why the Radio Commission desires a change in these figures, and I think the Senate will desire a change in the figures when they understand why it is asked for.

When this bill was acted upon in the committee, it was assumed that on page 21, line 5, the figure "\$32,000" was to cover alone printing and binding, but it also was to cover charges for stenographic reporting. No provision is made in the bill as it is now arranged to take care of the item of \$12,000 necessary to do the stenographic reporting. On the contrary, the amount of money which the Senate has provided, \$20,000, in line 5, is more money than is needed for printing and binding. That figure should be reduced, and the other figure, which would include stenographic reporting, should be increased.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I made that statement to the Senate, and the Senate did not agree with me. The Senate voted the other way. I can not do anything more.

Mr. COPELAND. I want the Senate to understand it, because I am going to ask that it be reconsidered.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator must not do that while the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] is out of the Chamber, or I should have to object.

Mr. COPELAND. We have been holding it up for a week on account of the Senator from Connecticut. When is he coming back?

Mr. SMOOT. I suggested exactly what the Senator does now, to increase the \$350,000 to \$366,000, and to reduce the \$20,000 on line 5 to \$16,000; and it was objected to.

Mr. COPELAND. That is what I am objecting to, that we should do this. We are leaving the Radio Commission without any funds for having stenographic reports made of their hearings. How can they make any legal conclusion? They have to go to court with all these matters, and there should be a fund provided out of which stenographic reports of hearings may be paid for. I am sure the Senator from Utah agrees with me in that matter. May I ask the Senator if he does?

Mr. SMOOT. I have already said that I made that statement to the Senate, and the Senate would not agree to it. If the Senator desires to speak to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] about it, well and good, but the action has already been taken, Mr. President.

Mr. COPELAND. I would like to have unanimous consent to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not grant that now, in the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator anticipates finishing the consideration of this bill within a few minutes, does he not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I think it will be some time before it is finished.

Mr. COPELAND. In view of the attitude of the Senator from Utah, an attitude which, if persisted in, will leave the Radio Commission absolutely helpless as regards the reporting of their hearings, which is essential to the formation of legal opinions, I shall retire from the floor. I hope I may be able to find the Senator from Connecticut, so that this important matter may be dealt with in a way which will serve the Government. We are asked to give the commission \$4,000 more than they need for printing and binding, and to take away from them \$12,000 which they do need for the stenographic reporting of their hearings.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not like to have the Senator say that the Senator from Utah insists. The Senator is asking exactly what the Senator from Utah asked the Senate to agree to, and they would not do it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Utah has just now objected to my request for unanimous consent to reconsider the vote.



Mr. SMOOT. Until the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], is in the Chamber. I have to protect the Senator from Connecticut, just the same as I would protect the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. When the Senator from Connecticut returns to the Chamber, I shall renew my request.

#### LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report on the economy measure was rejected. I do not know for sure, but I think to-day is the last day when the motion can be entered, so I desire to do so now. I may or may not call it up later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

The notice entered by Mr. JONES is as follows:

I desire to enter motions to reconsider the following votes in connection with the legislative appropriation bill H. R. 11267:

The vote further insisting upon its amendments Nos. 46 to 163, inclusive, and ordering the appointment of conferees;

The vote disagreeing to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 46; and

The vote rejecting the conference report.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10022) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 22, line 20, after the word "maintenance," to insert the words "including all motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles," under the item for "General Accounting Office," so as to read:

Contingent expenses: For traveling expenses, including stenographic reporting service outside of the District of Columbia, not exceeding \$2,500, by contract or otherwise; materials, supplies, equipment, and services; rent of buildings and equipment; purchase and exchange of books, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, typewriters, calculating machines, and other office appliances, including their development, repairs, and maintenance, including one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 22, line 22, where the committee proposes to strike out, under "General Accounting Office," the figures "\$145,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000," so as to read "and miscellaneous items, \$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, under "Valuation of property of carriers," on page 29, line 5, to strike out the numerals "\$2,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000," so as to read:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to complete carrying out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 19a), including one director of valuation at \$10,000 per annum, one supervisor of land appraisals, one supervising engineer, one supervisor of accounts, and one principal valuation examiner, at \$9,000 each per annum, and traveling expenses, \$750,000.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I think that if that item is to be taken up at this time it will be imperative to suggest the absence of a quorum, which I do at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bulow	Fletcher	Howell
Austin	Capper	Frazier	Johnson
Barbour	Carey	George	Jones
Bingham	Coolidge	Goldsborough	Kean
Black	Copeland	Hale	Kendrick
Blaine	Costigan	Hastings	Keyes
Borah	Couzens	Hatfield	La Follette
Bratton	Dale	Hawes	Lewis
Brookhart	Davis	Hayden	McGill
Broussard	Dickinson	Hebert	McNary

Metcalf  
Moses  
Norris  
Nye  
Oddie  
Patterson

Pittman  
Reed  
Robinson, Ark.  
Robinson, Ind.  
Sheppard  
Shortridge

Smoot  
Steiwer  
Stephens  
Thomas, Idaho  
Thomas, Okla.  
Townsend

Trammell  
Vandenberg  
Wagner  
Walcott  
Watson  
White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 29, line 5.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber, and I would like to know what the particular amendment under consideration is.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senate not to agree to this amendment.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has a very well-equipped accounting, valuation, and auditing department, which is particularly necessary at this time, because while there is agitation for the repeal of the so-called recapture clause, nothing has been done by either House with respect to repealing the recapture clause of the transportation act of 1920. While there is agitation, as I said, to have that clause of the act repealed, the Committee of the House on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have reported out a bill, but they have received no rule to take it up.

Under the valuation act, which was passed in 1913, the valuation of the railroads has been going on, and practically all the railroads have been valued as of 1914 values, plus the actual expenditures since that time. The needs of these valuations are very great in rate fixing, and they are particularly important in view of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is lending the railroads hundreds of millions of dollars, based on the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That obviously requires that the value of the securities which are to be placed with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as security for the loans be known.

Each one of the railroads has many grades of securities, the underlying mortgages, the junior mortgages, consolidated mortgages, and others, and it would be utterly impossible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to pass upon the value of those securities which are to be put up with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation if they did not know the value of the property. Neither would the Interstate Commerce Commission be able to fix a rate that was compensatory if they did not know the value of the property.

It will be observed that the House of Representatives allowed them \$2,750,000, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate cut the amount to \$750,000, a much larger cut than in any other provision in the bill.

It will be observed that the appropriations for other activities of the commission have been cut quite extensively, but nothing to the degree in which this particular item has been cut. It is impossible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to proceed under the transportation act if this item is cut in accordance with the recommendations of the committee.

I want to point out for a moment that much of the cut has been instigated by the railroads themselves.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he proceeds?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to his colleague?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator suggested any alternative to the language noted, or is he suggesting that the entire amount be restored?

Mr. COUZENS. I am insisting as strongly as I can that the amount fixed by the House be retained. There is no activity in which the commission is engaged or in which the Government is engaged that is any more important to the people of the United States than this particular work. Nearly everyone knows that the condition of the railroads is such that in all probability many of the loans which are being made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will never be repaid. In many cases the railroads are carrying an unreasonable and unnecessary amount of fixed charges,



as we who have kept in contact with the matter at all have seen evidenced, as, for instance, in cases like that of the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.

That company made application to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a substantial loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Interstate Commerce Commission pointed out that there was practically no possibility of the railroad continuing with its present financial set-up and therefore recommended that a new set-up or reorganization of their financial set-up be arranged. There is now under consideration a plan whereby the fixed charges of the railroad will be materially reduced and will have to be reduced prior to receiving any loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They have planned to take a large amount of the bonds, in the aggregate something like \$50,000,000, and clip the coupons for a 5-year period and put the coupons in escrow so as to save the paying out of interest now, but giving the holders of the bonds a continuing interest in the coupons which will be clipped and put in escrow. The escrow agreement will carry a provision that the holders of the bonds still have this claim upon the railroad and it will eventually be paid after a 5-year period out of the earnings of the railway, if any.

That is only an example of what the commission is doing. These activities can not be intelligently carried on if the auditing and accounting and valuation organizations should be disbanded, as would be required under the provision of the amendment.

One of the outstanding matters of interest that occurs to me, as the railroads are insisting that the appropriation be cut, is an analysis of the salaries and the number of officers maintained by some of the large systems of the country. For instance, some time ago the Interstate Commerce Commission sent a request to all of the Class I railroads for a list of their officers and the salaries paid on each system. In response to that request they received a very complete report from the Class I railroads. After having received the report, I asked the commission for a copy of it. I received a letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated June 21, and in order to put the matter fully before the Senate and not in any way to attempt to mislead them, because of some qualification, I desire to read the letter, as follows:

In response to your letter of June 20 I am sending you such information as the commission has on the subject of railroad salaries. It was obtained in response to a questionnaire which was sent to Class I railroads. The three documents which I am sending you are: (1) A summary and analysis of the returns to the questionnaire; (2) a statement showing the average annual salaries of the various groups of salaries as of March, 1932, and list of each position reported paying more than the average; and (3) the detail of the returns. It should be noted that the questionnaire called for a list of positions paying \$10,000 or more annually as of December, 1929, and the rate of pay of the same position as of March, 1932. It should also be noted that the process of reductions has been going on since March, 1932. Such reductions are shown in the returns in the case of the Pennsylvania and Missouri Pacific systems, and similar reductions have recently been announced in the newspapers in the case of the Atlantic Coast Line, the Louisville & Nashville, and the New York Central. Doubtless there are other similar instances.

A study of this report shows that the Pennsylvania Railroad as of March, 1932, had 100 officials with salaries of \$10,000 and over. The aggregate annual salaries was \$2,027,340, almost the amount for one railroad that is required by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the entire division therein created for the purpose of valuing and accounting and checking on the expenditures and operations of the railroads.

For example, as of March, 1932, the president of the Pennsylvania was getting a salary of \$135,000 a year, the vice president \$58,500 a year, five vice presidents of the western, central, eastern, New York, Chicago, and New England divisions received \$31,500 per year each; the vice president in charge of real-estate valuation and taxation \$36,000 a year. In other words, the official of the Pennsylvania Railroad alone who has charge of valuation and taxation received \$36,000 a year, four or five times as much as is paid to the officials of the Interstate Commerce Commission charged with the responsibility of valuation.

Then we have the vice president in charge of finance, \$45,000, vice president in charge of traffic \$45,000, vice pres-

ident in charge of operations \$54,000, and so on down the list, until there are enumerated 100 officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad receiving \$10,000 per year or in excess thereof. The report goes on to enumerate the large number of officers engaged by each of the large railroad systems.

And yet, Mr. President, the railroads are lobbying to have this appropriation cut from \$2,750,000 a year to \$750,000 a year. In other words, the whole appropriation might as well be eliminated and the whole activity might as well be eliminated as to take this means of wrecking the whole system maintained by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Let me refer to the Southern Pacific Railway, for example. The chairman of the executive committee receives \$135,000, the president \$90,000, the executive vice president \$36,000, vice president \$36,000, another vice president \$27,000, another vice president \$27,000, vice chairman of the executive committee \$76,500 per year, vice president in charge of operations \$31,500, vice president in charge of freight traffic \$27,000, and so on down the list, until it lists 35 officials receiving \$10,000 per year or more, the aggregate being \$1,191,930 per year.

Senators can go through the whole list of large railroads, the jurisdiction over which is in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission, charged with the responsibility of auditing and checking up all these activities, and yet the commissioners are asked to get along with an appropriation which is almost exactly the amount received by the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad alone.

Let me refer to the Baltimore & Ohio Co., which has 42 officers receiving \$10,000 per year or more. The president gets \$120,000 as of March, 1932; the senior vice president, \$76,500; one vice president, \$54,000; another vice president, \$45,000. Then they have a general manager in the East, who receives \$27,000 and a general manager in the West at \$18,000, a chief of motive power, \$29,700, and then there are general attorneys and attorneys receiving \$13,000 and \$14,000, up to \$25,000 per year. And yet these railroads are trying, so I am informed, through lobbying methods, to wreck the accounting and auditing and valuation organizations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For instance, take the case to which I just referred of the St. Louis & San Francisco system, which will go into the hands of receivers on July 1, 1932, unless they receive a substantial loan of \$5,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In spite of their financial condition, their president receives \$63,000 a year and the chairman of the board and executive committee, \$36,000 a year. They list 12 other officials receiving in excess of \$10,000 per year.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Has there been any reduction in these salaries since 1929?

Mr. COUZENS. Yes; there have been some reductions. I understand the president of the Pennsylvania has been reduced from \$150,000 to \$135,000 as of March last. While I have no official record, I am informed there has been another reduction from \$135,000 to \$122,500, but as to that I have not the absolute figures.

Now let us take the Wabash Railway, which is in the hands of receivers and has a very large and substantial loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The president of that system gets \$45,000 per year, the chief operating officer gets \$22,500, and the general counsel, \$27,000 per year. In other words, one general counsel for one railroad company gets the same salary that is now proposed for three Interstate Commerce Commissioners having the responsibility of the accounting and looking after the regulation of all the railroads.

Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate to go all through these files, but at a later time I am going to ask that these may be made a Senate document so that Senators may have all of the information that I have concerning the amounts of salaries and the amounts of



overhead carried by these railroads. We hear from business, from railroads, from every sort of agency, condemnation of bureaucracy in the Federal Government, and yet I submit when the Pennsylvania Railroad has to carry 100 employees whose salaries aggregate over \$2,000,000 a year, it is evidence that there is undoubtedly a great deal of bureaucracy and unnecessary overhead expenditure there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, this amendment in its implications and in its actualities is far more important than anything that has come before us in the last few days save possibly the great relief bill. This amendment seeks to give to the railroads of the country substantially \$360,000,000. It seeks to do it by destroying the activity of the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon whose researches and investigations depends the amount that may ultimately be collected by the United States Government. In order that the few Senators who are here and are not listening to the proceedings of the celebrated convention at Chicago may understand just exactly the extent of the cuts in this appropriation, let me remind the Senate that the appropriation for 1931-32 for the department that made the particular researches was \$3,554,268; that the Budget recommendation in this year of economy, 1932-33, was \$3,233,231, being a cut of 9 per cent; that the appropriation provided by the House for 1932-33 is \$2,750,000, being a cut from the prior appropriation of 22 per cent; and that the Senate committee's recommendation in this bill which we are now discussing is \$750,000, being a cut from the former appropriation of 79 per cent.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I did not catch the figure which the House bill carried.

Mr. JOHNSON. The House bill carried \$2,750,000.

Mr. BORAH. And this bill reduces it to \$750,000?

Mr. JOHNSON. This bill carries \$750,000, and the difference will at once be obvious.

It is conceded practically by all those who are familiar with the subject that a proper performance of the work of valuation, upon which will be predicated the rights of the United States Government to recover under the railroad law and the recapture clause, will not be possible with any such appropriation as \$750,000. If that be so, if it be an accurate statement, as every man to whom I have talked, who is familiar with the subject, insists that it is, that the appropriation proposed by the Senate committee is inadequate for the necessary work upon which may be predicated the right of recovery out of the United States Government from the railroads, then this bill not only starves the particular department but it is apparently designed to prevent the collection from the railroads of the amount that is due from them unto the United States, and in effect repeals the existing law.

It has been determined by the United States Supreme Court in a case that is familiar to all Senators, the Dayton-Goose Creek case, that these sums under the recapture clause are due to the United States Government. It is a fact that some \$12,000,000 have been collected under the particular clause. It is also a fact for years the work of revaluation and other necessary activities, in order that a recovery may be had, have been pursued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if the money shall be denied the commission upon which they may proceed to make the recoveries for the United States, we are doing something here that to my mind is not only reprehensible, but in this particular period, when we are crying about economy and the necessity of our people to have money due them, and crying as well about taxation upon the overburdened people of this Nation, under those circumstances I say we are doing something that is infinitely worse than merely reprehensible.

Mr. President, I have not much sympathy with some kinds of economy; I have not much sympathy with some kinds of taxation; I have not much sympathy with the peculiar poli-

cies which have been pursued by this Government by which taxation and economies—economies cruel and tragic in character; taxation that is burdensome and onerous in character—have been put upon the American people.

I recall, sir—and I only recall it in order that we may remember some things that have passed, lest we forget—the \$250,000,000, almost a quarter of the deficit that was necessary for us to raise in order to balance the Budget, which we gave to nations of Europe in December last year by a moratorium, and that by providing for a moratorium ourselves then we made another moratorium this year practically inevitable at the demand of our debtors. This year, then, we have in addition \$270,000,000 of money that belongs to our taxpayers that will be accorded to our debtors by another moratorium. So we have \$250,000,000 last year, \$270,000,000 this year, \$520,000,000 in all, representing one-half the deficit, one-half practically of the amount in order to collect which we have levied these burdensome taxes upon our people; one-half the amount that in this time of depression and cataclysmic disaster we have had to search the pockets of those who are little able to pay, in order to make up the deficit. Now, sir, if at all I be correct in the premises to which I recur, by this bill we add substantially \$360,000,000 to the \$510,000,000 that so generously we give to Europe, making \$870,000,000 that in our generosity, first, we have given to debtors across the sea, who are well able to pay, and, secondly, to railroads, some of which are well able to pay also. It makes no difference if it may be asserted that some railroads have difficulty in paying. The fact of the matter is that the railroads which may pay represent the greater proportion of the \$360,000,000 that are due from them.

The steel corporation roads owe \$56,253,000 of this fund of \$360,000,000, or about 15.6 per cent. The dividends paid by the steel corporation roads between 1920 and 1930 were \$84,947,625. Of course, they can pay. Every one of the steel railroads, if those dividends were thus paid by them, can, of course, pay what it owes the Government. The only decision upon the subject which has been rendered by the United States Supreme Court says not only are they liable to pay but that they ought to pay. In addition to the steel company railroads to which I have alluded, there are the Pocahontas coal carriers which owe to the United States Government \$102,491,357, or 28.4 per cent of the total from all railroads. The dividends paid by these railroads in 1920 to 1930 aggregated \$238,959,711. Equally, of course, these roads can pay.

Beyond that, whether the dividends have been of one sort or another, whether the railroads have paid large dividends or small, it is an obligation due to the United States Government that these railroads owe, and if it be essential for the United States Government to collect at this time the sums that may be due to it, it is outrageous that the appropriation cut beyond hope of consummation shall preclude that possibility.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will look on page 26 of the bill, under the head of "Regulating commerce," he will find the item in which he is interested. In that paragraph we find the appropriation which has to do with the recapture of the amounts mentioned by the Senator. The House of Representatives cut that item down very greatly, \$383,560. The Senate Appropriations Committee, after hearing the situation explained, increased that appropriation by \$500,000. The question before us now is with regard to the valuation of the properties. That involves a very expensive proceeding, which, in the judgment of many people—

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, did the Senator ask me to yield for a question or for a speech?

Mr. BINGHAM. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he was arguing one item while we were considering another.



Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no; I was speaking of the reduction of the appropriation for railroad valuation work from \$2,750,000 to \$750,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. That item does not come just at this point in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. That may be all right; but it is not accurate. At any rate we are coming to it sooner or later, and I am presenting my views concerning it. The Senator does not have any objection to my presenting my views in relation to that particular item, does he?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was only sorry the Senator seemed to regard that item as being concerned with the recapture clause.

Mr. JOHNSON. I conceive the item to which I am addressing myself to be the most important one in this bill; and for fear I might not have the opportunity subsequently to be heard upon the subject or that I might be necessarily absent, I was presenting my views now upon that subject. That, however, is a privilege which is accorded to every Member of the Senate upon any amendment at any time and under any circumstances. So the Senate will pardon me if I proceed in that regard.

The amendment to which the Senator adverts does not affect in the slightest degree what I have been saying nor in any degree my criticism of the particular amendment that is contained in this bill and to which I am addressing myself. I insist that the reduction which has been made in the appropriation in the particular which I have indicated is a reduction which, if not designed to prevent the collection of the debt due to the United States Government, has that very effect. I object to that sort of reduction being made at this particular time.

There is another aspect of the amendment, too, in that it will result in the discharge of hundreds upon hundreds of skilled employees who through the years have been taught this very technical and this very trying work and who alone understand it and understand it thoroughly; and if that organization be once destroyed it will be with the utmost difficulty that it again can be created or again can perform the duties that it has been performing in the past. From every aspect it would be a gross error and mistake upon our part to destroy the organization that has been built up in the years. It will be worse than that to destroy it at this time and preclude the collection of the amount that may be due the United States Government under the railroad law and recapture clause from railroads well able to pay their just debts.

I protest, therefore, against a peculiar reduction such as this. There has not been in any other appropriation bill a reduction of 79 per cent; and there is not any reason on the face of the earth for a reduction here, in this particular item, except the desire and design to preclude the collection from the railroads of the country of the amounts that are justly due from those railroads, and indirectly to repeal the existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTERSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious to anyone who has made a study of the item under consideration that what is sought to be accomplished by the Committee on Appropriations is the repeal of the valuation act. The adoption of the amendment as recommended by the committee can have no other effect than wrecking the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission. My information is that it will result in the discharge of 700 highly trained employees who have been engaged in making these important valuation studies over a period of years.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Senate a letter which I received from Commissioner Eastman under date of June 13:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, June 13, 1932.

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your request, I am sending you herewith a memorandum in regard to our Bureau of Valuation, and the effect upon that bureau and its work of the proposed cut of nearly 80 per cent in its appropriation.

As has been just pointed out by the senior Senator from California.

The following table with respect to the appropriations for the various departments of the commission's work may be of interest in this connection:

	1932 appropriation	Budget, 1933 estimate	House 1933 appropriation	Proposed Senate appropriation
General.....	\$3,090,900	\$2,925,354	\$2,875,354	\$2,600,000
Accounts.....	1,504,420	1,383,560	883,560	883,560
Safety.....	534,660	511,732	511,732	500,000
Signals.....	48,260	47,174	47,174	40,000
Locomotives.....	504,865	485,359	485,359	400,000
Valuation.....	3,554,368	3,233,231	2,750,000	750,000
Printing.....	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
Total.....	9,412,473	8,761,410	7,228,089	5,348,560

The proposed appropriation does not, we understand, make allowance for the further reduction which may result from the cutting of salaries and wages or the establishment of the furlough plan.

It will be noted that the chief cuts made by the House under the Budget estimates were in the appropriations for the Bureau of Accounts and the Bureau of Valuation. These cuts were made on the theory that the recapture provisions of the law would be repealed.

Here is a complete answer to the contention made by the Senator from Connecticut.

Upon that theory we did not object to the cut in our valuation appropriation to \$2,750,000—

Commissioner Eastman, of course, refers to the cut made by the House from \$3,554,368, which was the appropriation in 1932. The Budget estimated \$3,233,231, and the House cut the item to \$2,750,000.

But we did object to the proposed slaughter of our Bureau of Accounts. At the hearing before the Senate subcommittee we concentrated upon the proposed cut of \$1,000,000 in the appropriation for that bureau, showing that it was based upon a complete misapprehension of the effect of recapture repeal upon the need for that bureau and its work. Apparently that argument had some effect, as is shown by the restoration of \$500,000. But the Senate committee now proposes to slaughter the Bureau of Valuation instead. In the meantime it has become apparent that recapture will not be repealed at this session.

The memorandum which I am sending you is confined to the Bureau of Valuation. As for the other cuts, they will hamper us in our work, but under present emergency conditions we are not disposed to press an objection.

A very reasonable point of view, I submit, Mr. President.

The cut is very severe in the case of the Bureau of Accounts, and we are of the opinion that even in the present emergency the reduction should stop at \$1,000,000 instead of going to \$883,560. However, we shall hope to recover some of this lost ground in future years, and in the meantime we may be able to avoid wholesale discharge in that bureau by some scheme of voluntary furloughs without pay or possibly by reducing materially per diem for traveling expenses. Of course, this means sacrifice by the men in addition to that imposed by the threatened pay cuts. In the case of the Bureau of Valuation, however, the cut goes so far that there would be no possibility of saving the bureau from ruin.

In my judgment, the record of the commission shows that it has never asked for greater appropriations than it needed. After the war, its work increased enormously, in view of the many new duties imposed upon it. It was obliged to ask for increased appropriations, but even with their aid it has not been able to keep fully abreast of its work, although of late there has been marked improvement in that direction. I believe that all who are familiar with the commission's work will concede that it is a hard-working body. Moreover, I call attention to the fact that at the present session Congress has imposed two new duties upon the commission, one in connection with railroad loans and the other in connection with the proposed 6-hour day for railroad employees. The first of these new duties has proved to be of great magnitude, and the second to be of very considerable magnitude.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH G. EASTMAN, Commissioner.

Now, I refer to the memorandum which was inclosed in the letter from Commissioner Eastman concerning the Bureau of Valuation, because I agree with the statement made by the Senator from California that this is one of the most important questions that the Congress has confronted—the proposal to repeal the valuation act by indirection.

There is not a Senator here who believes that if the proposition to repeal the valuation act was presented in a separate bill it would have any chance to be passed at this session of



Congress, but the Appropriations Committee, hostile to the purposes and the public protection contained in the valuation section of the law, proposes by indirection to achieve that objective. It proposes to hamstring and destroy the valuation work of the Interstate Commerce Commission by cutting off its funds.

Mr. President, there never was a time when it was more necessary for the protection of the Government and the protection of the public interest that the valuation work should be carried on.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I want to ask the Senator if he does not think this appropriation is perhaps more necessary than ever at this time in view of the general clamor for railroad consolidations. They can not, of course, approve any consolidation without knowing the value of the property to be consolidated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course; but the railroads and their friends would be delighted to have this bureau destroyed, because it is the only agency which can protect the public in the premises, not only in the consolidations but in the other vital and important problems which will be presented for solution during this period of depression concerning the steam transportation systems of the United States.

Referring now to the memorandum:

The appropriation for this bureau for the year ending June 30, 1932, is \$3,554,368. The commission asked the Bureau of the Budget for the same appropriation for the year ending June 30, 1933. The Budget cut this to \$3,238,231. The House of Representatives voted to appropriate \$2,750,000. The Senate committee now proposes to reduce this to \$750,000. This would cut the present appropriation by \$2,804,368, or 78.9 per cent.

Such a reduction would disrupt and ruin an organization of engineers, accountants, land appraisers, examiners, and attorneys, trained in the work of valuation over a long period of years. There is no better equipped or more efficient valuation organization in the country. It would compel the discharge of about 700 of these specialists, many of them supporting families on small salaries, at a time when it would be impossible for most of them to obtain other employment.

This sum of \$750,000 is to be appropriated, according to the proposed bill—

Now, mark this, Mr. President—

to enable the commission to "complete carrying out" the objects of the valuation act of 1913, now section 19a of the interstate commerce act. The idea, apparently, is that this appropriation is to wind up and close the valuation work. In other words, the proposal is to repeal the valuation act by indirection, without any actual repeal or even consideration of repeal by Congress.

Moreover, to "complete carrying out" the objects of the valuation act within a single year is impossible. The idea betrays ignorance of that act. The act contemplates by its very terms a continuing process of valuation, a readjustment of values each year to reflect changes in property and depreciation and after considering changes in unit prices and land values. There is nothing static about railroad properties or their values. They are continually changing, a fact which was clearly recognized in the 1913 act.

The practical repeal of the valuation act was urged at this session of Congress by the Association of Railway Executives before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

They tried the direct method, Mr. President. Let us see how far they got with it.

The commission opposed such action, and the arguments pro and con were presented at length at public hearings. The House committee was unanimous against such repeal. The subject has not even been considered by any Senate committee.

And I am sure the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate will confirm that statement of fact.

Yet it is here proposed, in the last days of the session and without any bill to repeal before Congress, to accomplish the same purpose and ruin the valuation organization of the commission by cutting the life out of its appropriation.

One of the important uses of valuation, under the present law, is in connection with the recapture of excess railroad earnings, dating back to 1920.

Here is the answer to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut that the valuation bureau had nothing to do with recapture:

The commission favors the repeal of the recapture provisions, both for the future and retroactively, and has presented its reasons therefor to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee has reported in favor of such repeal, but it has been able to obtain no action by the House on its recommendation. The subject has not been considered at all by any Senate committee. But if the valuation appropriation is reduced as now proposed all effective work on valuation must stop. The bureau of accounts is also utilized by the commission in this recapture work to audit the income accounts of the carriers. Its present appropriation is \$1,504,420, and it is proposed to cut this to \$833,560.

I submit, Mr. President, that the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, a member of the Appropriations Committee, shows how ill-considered is the recommendation of the committee in regard to this amendment. The Senator was under the impression that the valuation division had nothing to do with recapture.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President! The Senator has made a great many statements in his enthusiasm that are not quite in accordance with my own understanding of my own statements.

(At this point a message was received from the House of Representatives, which appears elsewhere in the Senate proceedings.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield in a moment. I wish to make a statement in my own right.

I heard what the Senator from Connecticut said when he interrupted the Senator from California. The Senator from California was making a very telling argument concerning the recapture provisions of the interstate commerce act and its importance to the Treasury, to the taxpayers, and to the public generally. He had adverted at the outset to the drastic cut of practically 80 per cent in the valuation item in this appropriation bill.

The Senator from Connecticut rose, interrupted the Senator from California, and tried to tell the Senator from California that his remarks on recapture in connection with the appropriation for the valuation bureau were irrelevant because the bureau had nothing to do with recapture.

I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator from Connecticut, but I stand upon the interpretation of his interruption which I have made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, what I tried to say, but evidently did not make myself clear, was that the item which the Senator is now discussing, relating to valuation, while, of course, the basis for the work on recapture, did not concern the actual business of securing the actions in connection with recapture, and I adverted to the fact that the committee had increased that item, which we were told was the item connected with the actual recapturing of these amounts, by some \$500,000.

We all understand perfectly that the work of revaluation, which I shall have something to say about in a few minutes, is the basis on which these other claims are made; but the Government has already spent over \$41,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In just a second. The Senator from Connecticut has served to muddy the water a little, but if he will only allow his remarks to stand without revision the way they were uttered, I am perfectly willing to let my interpretation of them stand.

Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I shall be very glad also, because the initial premise of the Senator from Connecticut was that the Senate was dealing with an amendment other than that of which I was speaking, and he referred to that other amendment and said that it had nothing whatever to do with the particular matter which I was discussing, and with some degree of pleasantry I said to him that under those circumstances I had a right of discussion anyway, and so I would proceed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the explanation of the Senator from Connecticut has not altered my opinion



of the value of the recommendation made by the committee concerning this item, because the committee either did not understand what it was doing, or else it knew too well. I have not made up my mind as yet which is the proper interpretation of its action.

If recapture work is to be carried on, both of these bureaus will need every cent that the commission has asked for them. It has not been possible to keep the work fully current on the present appropriations, although tremendous progress has been made in bringing the recapture proceedings to culmination.

It is respectfully submitted that it is contrary to all sound public policy to put an end, without repeal, to important provisions of the law by withholding in the last hours of the session, when there is no opportunity for adequate consideration, the appropriations necessary to carry them out. It is also submitted, if the financial emergency be offered as an excuse, that it will not help the country to put 700 or more employees, most of them heads of families, on the street.

I continue to quote from this memorandum, which I think is very compelling in the force of the argument which it presents:

#### HISTORY OF VALUATION ACT

The valuation act of 1913 was passed by Congress after repeated recommendations for such legislation by the commission beginning as early as 1903. It was then an admitted fact that the property investment accounts of the railroads did not, in general, record either cost or value and were utterly unreliable. The Supreme Court had laid down the rule that a railroad or other public utility company is entitled to a reasonable return on the fair value of its property used in the public service, and the railroads were beginning to submit in rate cases before the commission and before the courts elaborate property valuations prepared by their own engineers and experts. Shippers were without protection against such evidence. Valuation questions were also continually arising in connection with taxation. This was, in brief, the genesis of the valuation act.

It does not, however, adequately describe the long legislative battle fought over the question of establishing the principle of valuing the railroad properties of the United States. My illustrious father fought for years on the floor of the Senate, defeated time and time again, but in 1913 he forced through the Congress the valuation act.

What the country would have been up against without the bureau of valuation may be indicated by a single illustration, which is completely typical. In the recapture case of the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac the carrier claimed a value of \$62,359,946 for the year ended December 31, 1923. The commission's valuation for that year, which was above the actual cost of the property, was \$30,100,000.

The undertaking was a gigantic one, and it has cost the Government a great deal of money.

No one denies that.

Since 1913 the total expenditures have been about \$42,000,000, but that is a small sum, spread over 19 years of work, when compared with the property involved, costing upwards of \$20,000,000,000. The basic valuations have been practically completed, and the Government has an accurate inventory of all railroad property checked up to about 1927.

Yet, Mr. President, this committee proposes by indirection to destroy this valuable work when it is about to be checked up and brought down to date.

The work of bringing the inventory and valuations down to date has not been completed, but great progress has been made in that direction. As already pointed out, it is, of course, a continuing process.

#### USES OF VALUATION

What has been done has been of great value to the railroads and to the country. Any idea to the contrary is based on a misunderstanding of the situation. It has given the railroads an inventory and knowledge of their own property which they did not theretofore have, which they could have got in no other way, and which has been of positive money benefit to them. It has disclosed the railroads which are overcapitalized and those which are undercapitalized. This information is continually used by the commission in the regulation of security issues, and is now being used every day in passing upon the matter of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the railroads. Engineers and attorneys of the bureau of valuation have been impressed into that emergency work.

Mr. President, at the very time when we are extending the largesse of this Government to these railroads through loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations to cut off the arm of the Government service prepared to protect the public interest in connection with the making of those loans, just as it has been protecting it in the issuance of securities.

In my judgment, Mr. President, these are two of the vital reasons for the slash in this item made by the committee.

Under the law, valuations must be taken into account in passing upon consolidations of railroads, and such valuations form an important part of the evidence in the proceeding involving the so-called 4-system plan of consolidation in eastern territory which is now pending before the commission.

It was to that work of the valuation bureau that the Senator from Michigan drew attention a moment ago.

Under the law, also, they must be taken into consideration in passing upon the divisions of joint rates between railroads.

There is hardly an activity of the Interstate Commerce Commission which, when we run it down, is not found in some way, either directly or indirectly, related to the work of the valuation division.

In the new system of depreciation accounting which the commission has prescribed for the railroads at the behest of Congress, valuation data were found to be absolutely essential in establishing a uniform and reliable base for such accounting.

Yet it is proposed, Mr. President, to destroy this bureau, and to cut off the gathering of these essential data, so necessary to the many activities and vitally important work of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

States are constantly calling on the commission for valuation information to aid them in equalizing taxation.

Special needs for valuation data are continually arising. Last Friday a tentative valuation of the Pullman Co. as of December 31, 1931, was approved for service. It brings the valuation up to that date from the basic valuation as of June 30, 1919. It was called for six weeks ago for use in a Pullman fare case. Occasion has arisen for a valuation of the property of the Inland Waterways Corporation. Requisition was made on the bureau of valuation in late April. The report as of current date was placed in the hands of the commission last Saturday. It was requested by the Secretary of War. A requisition was made on April 20 for a current valuation of railroad warehouse property in New York and vicinity, and it is now ready. It was called for in connection with an investigation of the warehouse situation by the commission. There are similar requisitions out for current valuations of railroad properties in the Chicago switching district for use in the adjudication of switching rates, and for similar valuations of Kansas City terminal properties for use in adjusting charges between litigating carriers. Work will soon be begun on a current valuation of ice-manufacturing plants of transcontinental carriers, in connection with an investigation of the cost of refrigeration service and the charges therefor.

These uses for valuation data have been mentioned to show that the use in connection with the recapture of excess earnings is far from the sole use. So long as recapture is a part of the law, valuation is absolutely essential. There is no possible escape from it, but the uses do not end there by any manner of means.

Not only does the bureau of valuation undertake to maintain a complete inventory of railroad property and to keep informed of the constant changes in that property, but it undertakes also to keep fully informed as to changes in the unit costs for labor and materials in railroad construction work and the similar changes in railroad land values. It further keeps informed in regard to the progress of depreciation in railroad physical property resulting not only from the action of wear and tear and the elements but also from such factors as obsolescence and inadequacy.

Mark this:

The commission is in a position to produce within 60 days a reliable estimate of the current physical valuation of the railroads, as a whole, or for the recognized rate groups.

Are we ready, Mr. President, to destroy the valuation work and thus leave not only the commission but the Congress without this vitally essential information when treating with these vast problems which are constantly arising?

The commission is in a position to produce within 60 days a reliable estimate of the current physical valuation of the railroads, as a whole or for the recognized rate groups. Such data were produced in the recent 15 per cent rate increase case, Ex parte No. 103. While the commission can not now do this for each individual railroad, it will soon be able to do so, provided it is permitted to go ahead with its work.

Under present conditions and on the basis of present earnings and present market values for their securities, it may be argued that valuation of the physical properties of the railroads has lost all practical importance. But it was only a brief three or four years ago, when market prices for securities and reproduction cost indices were at top levels, that some estimates of aggregate railroad values ran as high as \$40,000,000,000 or even \$50,000,000,000. Based on past experience with prophecies, it is a rash man who can be sure that the situation will not change as radically in the other direction within the next three or four years.

Furthermore, the railroads have until recently been claiming the benefit of valuations based on reproduction costs much higher



than original cost, and the tendency of the Supreme Court has been to sustain them in such claims. At the present time reproduction costs are trending rapidly in the other direction. There are many railroads whose reproduction cost is now below original cost, and there soon will be more. Under these conditions the interest of both railroads and public utilities in physical valuation is evaporating. The public is clearly entitled to the services of an organization which can produce on short notice the facts in regard to current reproduction costs and current depreciation, and this is what the bureau of valuation, as at present organized and equipped, can do. It is impossible to say when the need for such information may arise.

It is at least conceivable that if the present economic depression continues, it may be necessary for the Government to take over the railroads, as it did in the war emergency, for a period of time. If there should be need for such action in any one of a number of possible forms, the existence of a well-equipped bureau of valuation with complete valuation data at its command would be an invaluable protection to the country against possible unwarranted claims. Under such circumstances it would be folly now to disrupt and ruin this organization.

It requires years of time to build up a trained and experienced organization, such as the commission now has in its Bureau of Valuation. It takes only a short time to wreck such an organization, and that is what is now proposed. It is respectfully submitted that not even the present financial emergency is justification for such drastic action.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear what is proposed by the committee. It is proposed by the committee to reduce so drastically the appropriations as in effect to achieve the repeal of the valuation act, now section 19 (a) of the interstate commerce act. It is also perfectly clear that this is part and parcel of the campaign which has been carried on in this country to wreck not only the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but finally and eventually to curtail its activities altogether. The wildest and most absurd kind of charges have been made that the Interstate Commerce Commission has resulted in wrecking the railroads, whereas, on the contrary, any person who has studied the problem knows that it is the Interstate Commerce Commission which has made it possible for the railroads to survive the impact of the general economic situation as well as they have done.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is responsible for curbing the unjustifiable and indefensible financial policies of the railroads. It forced the railroads to adopt an accounting system which would protect not only the stockholders, but also the shippers and the traveling public. It is the Interstate Commerce Commission which has stood four-square against mergers and consolidations such as that proposed by the Van Swearingens, and it was only when they found the new device of holding companies that they were able to go on with their scheme for unloading upon the public millions upon millions of dollars of worthless securities. Mr. President, it would be a tragedy, in the face of the emergency character of the depression, for us at this time to strike down the only arm of the Federal Government which can protect the public interests in meeting some of the critical transportation problems which will arise.

As has been suggested in the concluding paragraph of the memorandum, which I have read to the Senate, and as I have suggested myself upon the floor of the Senate on several different occasions, if the present economic trend in this country continues in the direction which it has been going in the last 26 months, it will in all probability be necessary for the Government to take over the steam-transportation systems of the United States in order to secure a distribution of the essential commodities—food, clothing, and other materials—without which the great metropolitan cities can not exist for more than 48 hours. Can it be that intelligent Senators charged with the responsibility of protecting the public interest will now do away with the valuation division? If the necessity arises of taking over the railroads it would be the only agency that checks the claimed value of the railroads and prove their actual value at the time when they were taken over. We had an experience in taking over the railroads during the war. We had experience with the exorbitant claims which they presented when they were returned to private management.

In view of the situation, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to reject the committee amendment and to let the item as agreed upon in the House committee and by the

House of Representatives stand in the bill. It is already a drastic cut over the 1932 appropriation. In view of its record of service and efficiency I think we can rely upon the statements made by such men as Joseph B. Eastman and other commissioners that the sum of \$2,750,000 is the irreducible minimum with which this bureau may be maintained and may continue its valuable services in protecting the public interests in connection with one of the most important phases in the present economic situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I was not present when this reduction was considered and made. I was engaged night and day with the Finance Committee meetings and was not able to be present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee. I know the Appropriations Committee decided that under the present circumstances and conditions in the country it would be almost useless to continue the valuation of property, when no one could really arrive at what the real valuation may be. I am quite sure that is the reason why the Appropriations Committee made the reduction in this item. In other words, I can not myself see what advantage there would be to try to arrive at the valuation of a railroad property under conditions existing to-day as compared to what they were two years ago or as compared to what they may be two years from now. Nobody could tell. I think the committee took the position, that being the case, that there is no necessity for appropriation \$2,750,000. I know of no other reason. I can not think of any other reason than that for the reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I was at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this matter was considered. We were under compulsion to effect an economy in the appropriation bill of at least 10 per cent. It was a dreadful experience anyhow, and we were almost at a loss to know what to do or how to change the bill to bring about a 10 per cent reduction. I am sure there was no feeling in the committee as regards the principles contended for here so ably by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. It was a question of where we could get the money. That was our problem.

In looking over the various activities involved in the bill and because of the necessity for making a reduction of 10 per cent, it seemed it might be done in part here. There was no question of the principle involved, I am confident. There was no desire on the part of the committee to do what was done, but we had orders, or expected to have orders, from the Senate to save 10 per cent on the bill, and that is what we tried to do. I dare say, from what I have heard to-day, that it was an unfortunate thing we did.

I feel sorry for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He has had a battle all through these weeks, because on every bill which came to his committee the committee was under a command, or threat of a command, to reduce the amounts 10 per cent. That is why it was done here. The Senate has to decide whether it will exercise the economy seeking to make the aggregate 10 per cent reduction and include this reduction, or whether they will disregard their order to the committee for a 10 per cent reduction.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Wisconsin intimated at least that the railroads had been asking for this reduction. I do not know of a single railroad man that ever wrote a letter to the committee; I do not know about the individual members of the committee, but they did not write to me; and no railroad man ever called upon me in any way, shape, manner, or form with reference to this item. I think the statement of the Senator from New York and what I have said covers the whole question as it occurred. It is with the Senate. We thought that by making the cuts as we have made them, we were making those least detrimental to the Government service. Our judgment may be wrong. But I want every Senator to understand that there was no feeling in this regard whatsoever.



Mr. President, I have been here nearly 30 years. I have been on the Appropriations Committee for nearly 20 years. I have never passed through such strenuous times, I have never had such experiences in all my life, and I never anticipated ever having such experiences as we have had in that committee during this session. I know just as well as I know that I am living that we make mistakes, but what body of men ever lived under such circumstances that would not make mistakes? We do not say that all the bills reported by our committee are perfect. We do not say our action is the best that could be taken. But I do say that our action is the best that the committee in its judgment thought proper to recommend to be taken. That much I do know.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I only want to say in confirmation of what the Senator from Utah has said that I do not believe there was a bit of railroad influence either pro or con involved in this cut. I know that it did not enter my mind. It will be recalled that I introduced a resolution a long time ago and it was referred to the Appropriations Committee providing that instead of taking 10 per cent off each bill, we would make the aggregate reduction of 10 per cent on all bills together, but it was not considered. The only thing I saw in the committee was evidence of a sincere desire to find the way to make the 10 per cent reduction. Here we found \$2,000,000 of the 10 per cent, though what we have heard here to-day makes me think it was a bad economy; but it seems that we have to find it and here is a way to reduce by \$2,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. It was also called to the attention of the committee that the basic valuation was about completed. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made that statement here to-day, identically the same statement.

So when we considered, all the items in the bill, trying to cut appropriations with the least detriment to the service, the committee decided that this was a place where a reduction could appropriately be made.

Whatever the Senate desires to do in the matter, I am not going to object, but I do not want to be criticized, and I am quite sure the committee does not, in a way that is altogether uncalled for. No railroad men had any influence with us; no railroad man ever spoke to a member of the committee so far as I know.

Furthermore, we know, as has been stated here, that the basic valuation of the railroads has been about completed; and I thought that in a work that was so nearly completed there could possibly be made a reduction in the appropriation, particularly in view of the fact that when the valuation shall be completed there can be no assurance of what it means, because there is no property in the United States, or in the world for that matter, which to-day has any fixed value; the only value that can be put upon most things now is what some one is willing to pay for them. The value may be one thing to-day, and it may be entirely different on the morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am going to attempt to pour some oil on the troubled waters, and I should like to have the attention of members of the committee.

I have no doubt the committee were moved by no motive that was dishonorable or ulterior. I realize that the committee had a difficult task; there is no question about that. If those of us who are not on the Committee of Appropriations will just call to mind the conditions under which certain appropriation bills were sent back to the committee and the conditions under which we have tried and the House has tried to bring about economy, on the one hand, and increase taxation where it would be felt the least, on the other hand, we will realize what a tremendous task has been imposed upon the committee. There never was such a task imposed upon the Appropriations Committee heretofore. However, it ought to be apparent now to the members of the committee—and of course no disrespect is intended to them when this statement is made—that a mis-

take has been made in this particular instance. With all the burdens the committee had resting upon them in connection with the various appropriation bills referred to them for consideration and all the other work the members of the committee have had to do, it is to be wondered that they did not make more mistakes. It ought to be plain now, however, as I have said, that in this particular instance a reduction made with the best of intentions, without any ulterior motives or anything of that kind, was a mistake, and it seems to me the committee ought now to realize, as the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] so courageously says, that probably a mistake was made. Of course, it is only human to make mistakes. I do not think anybody is finding fault with the members of the committee because we feel they have made a mistake, for they have been overburdened, as I have said. It is to be wondered that they have not made more mistakes.

Mr. President, involved in this item is \$361,000,000 due to the Government of the United States from railroad companies. If this amendment shall be adopted and carried into execution, it will have the effect of preventing the collection of this amount of money and of preventing it even from drawing interest. That is one of the peculiarities under the law, as I understand it.

I think the argument made by Mr. Eastman, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as read by the Senator from Wisconsin, is absolutely unanswerable. No Senator doubts Mr. Eastman's sincerity or his ability or his unselfishness, and he has presented the facts. The effect, if this amendment shall be approved, will redound to the benefit of the railroad companies, which together owe the Government of the United States \$360,000,000, which at this time would more than balance the Budget.

It has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in at least two cases that the money is the property of the United States; but there is some work yet to be done, even in those cases, as I said a moment ago, to put the claims of the Government in a condition where the amounts due it will commence to draw interest if they are not paid. It happens that most of the railroads which owe the Government money under the recapture clause of the transportation act are railroad companies owned by the United States Steel Corporation and four of the great coal-carrying roads which have been enormously prosperous. Of course, if they had not been prosperous, they would not have owed this money. The money now due the Government of the United States represents excess earnings. According to the information I have, it will take some time for the valuations bureau to get the cases in proper shape.

The Senator from Utah said the work, as he understood, is about finished, and such a conclusion might be drawn by many people; but, in my opinion, the valuation of the railroads never will be finished because, as the Senator from Utah truly said, what the valuation of a given property was last year may not be a fair valuation now. We must have a board continually at work on the subject. The railroads were valued as of a certain date; then, in order to keep the valuation up to date, there have to be added to the valuation such increases as may have affected the value or subtracted such decreases as may have affected it.

Under the provisions of the law there are a little over \$360,000,000 now due the Government, and it is entitled to the money. It has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dayton-Goose Creek case, and in one other case, that this money is due and belongs to the Government of the United States, amounting to \$360,000,000, as I have said, which would more than balance the Budget.

There will be due interest on this amount of money. It will not be an exact amount; the total sum due will probably be a little more than I have indicated when the figures are brought up to date, and interest will begin to accrue to the Government of the United States as soon as the cases are heard and an order issued stating the exact amount due. That work has not been completed as yet, and that is what the valuation bureau is going to do. That is the bureau



that is to be put out of business if the committee amendment shall be adopted. So its indirect effect, but its effect just the same, is finally to stop this bureau from any further action.

The bureau of valuation is composed of technical men, high-class men, engineers, who have given a world of service to this character of work. The adoption of this amendment will scatter them to the four winds of heaven. So the effect will be the same as to repeal the law under which the Government of the United States is entitled to \$360,000,000. As Commissioner Eastman says in the memorandum which the Senator from Wisconsin read, the Board of Railway Executives appeared before the House committee and made a direct attack upon this bureau. They wanted to repeal the law itself. The commission resisted it before the House committee. The House committee heard arguments on both sides and, I understand, unanimously decided with the commission and against the contention of the railroads. If such a provision had been put in the bill, it would have had exactly, as I understand, the same effect as though we would adopt this amendment reported by the committee. So this is an indirect method of accomplishing what the railroads were unable to accomplish by direct methods.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to inquire of the Senator whether he is advised that a bill has been introduced in the House which proposes to forgive this entire indebtedness of \$360,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. I think there is such a bill pending there.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is some measure of that kind pending; and, of course, if it should be passed, there would not be any need of any further valuation proceedings.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not know how far that bill had progressed.

Mr. NORRIS. At least it will have to pass the Senate before it can become a law, and, in fact, it will also have to pass the House, for I understand it has not as yet passed that body.

In other words, this \$360,000,000 is as it were hanging in the air. Before the Government of the United States can get it, orders must be issued and in many cases the valuation brought down to date. I understand that it will take from two to three years to complete that work. Some of it probably can be accomplished in a shorter time in the case of some of the railroads, but in other cases a longer time will be required.

The memorandum which I have from the Interstate Commerce Commission indicates that from two to three years' work by the present corps of the bureau of valuation will dispose of the pending cases involving \$361,000,000. I do not think that is disputed; I do not think there is any controversy about it. What the railroad presidents undertook to do, as the Senator from Florida has intimated, was to have this debt forgiven unless the railroads keep it. The money is now in the hands of the railroads, the steel-company railroads, and the coal railroads mostly, and until the work of valuation is completed by the bureau the money will stay with them, and if it is never completed, they will never pay the amounts due.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to say to the Senator that the committee would have been delighted if the attitude now expressed had been given voice before it passed on this bill. The committee did not want to take this action.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it did not; I realize that.

Mr. COPELAND. But it had a hammer over its head; it was required to cut the appropriations contained in this bill 10 per cent. If the Senator can convince the Senate that that 10 per cent mandate that was sent us has been set aside, there will not be anybody more pleased than will I.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I can not set aside a mandate, but because the Senate sent the bill back to the committee with instructions to reduce the aggregate 10 per cent it does not follow that when it comes back here, we are bound by the action of the committee. This is a reduction, so far as the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned, of practically 80 per cent.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. I agree with what the Senator says, and, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote with him to put the appropriation back, and I venture to say other members of the committee will be in the same frame of mind; but when we had the item before the committee, there was nothing left for us to do but to dig up this million dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator; but I wanted to make it plain that I did not want, even by indirection, to cast any reflection upon the committee; and the readiness with which the Senator from New York shows his willingness to right what has been a mistake, caused evidently by overburdening the committee with work which was put upon them, is very gratifying. We can rectify it by rejecting the amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I may be courageous, but I am not going to say we made a mistake. We carried out the instructions of the Senate, and that is all.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. I am willing to disregard that instruction if the Senate desires.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator can put it in that way if he wishes; I will not even say they made a mistake, although I think they did make a perfectly innocent mistake, and, as I said a while ago, it is a wonder to me that they have not made more of them, in view of the enormous burden which the Senate has put upon their shoulders.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. In order to be perfectly fair to the committee, I want also to call attention to the fact that after the Senate instructed the Appropriations Committee to bring in the bill with a 10 per cent reduction, the House itself began to cut the appropriations 10 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not any doubt about that.

Mr. SMOOT. And then when that 10 per cent was taken off and the bills came to the Senate, instructions were given that another 10 per cent be taken off.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that; and I said that, in substance, in one of the bills that we sent back.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to some of these railroads, and how much of this \$361,000,000 they owe.

Here is the Bessemer & Lake Erie, owned by the Steel Corporation. It is one of the steel roads. It is an open secret that some of those roads made enormous profits. That road owes the Government of the United States—and it is a part of this \$361,000,000—\$11,370,624.

The Birmingham Southern owes \$236,077.

The Carbon County Railroad owes \$21,995.

The Donora Southern owes \$14,773.

The Duluth & Iron Range owes \$1,670,203.

The Duluth, Missabe & Northern owes \$25,462,836.

The Elgin, Joliet & Eastern owes \$9,374,365.

The Etna & Montrose owes \$18,208.

The Hannibal Connecting Railroad owes \$29,455.

The Johnstown & Stony Creek owes \$24,868.

The Lake Terminal Railroad owes \$58,589.

The Newburgh & South Shore owes \$61,132.

The Northampton & Bath owes \$78,660.

The Union Railroad owes \$3,814,226.

The Youngstown & Northern owes \$22,630.

Those are steel railroads, owned by the United States Steel Corporation. Most of them are engaged to a very large extent in the transportation from the mines to the factories



of iron ore and the transportation of steel products. The amount owed by these steel railroads makes a total of \$56,258,641, or 15.6 per cent of the recapture liability of all the railroads in the United States.

They owe that money to the Government of the United States. If we ever expect to get it, we must defeat the Senate committee amendment, because that makes it impossible to carry on the work that is going to perfect the title of the Government of the United States to this money. At the present time it does not draw interest—none of it.

Now let us see what the dividends paid by those roads were. This is no hardship on anybody.

The dividends paid by these railroads from 1920 to 1930 amounted to \$84,947,625.

Here are some coal railroads that get a good percentage of this money:

The Chesapeake & Ohio owes the Government of the United States \$47,779,611.

The Hocking Valley owes the United States Government, as a part of this \$361,000,000, \$5,241,114.

The Norfolk & Western, as its part of that \$361,000,000, owes the Government \$42,106,462.

The Virginian Railway owes the Government \$7,384,770.

Making a total of \$102,491,957, or 28.4 per cent of the total owed by all the railroads in the United States.

The dividends paid by these railroads from 1920 to 1930 amounted to \$239,959,711.

Let me call attention again to the fact that every penny of this money constitutes excess earnings which, under the law, it was the duty of those railroads to pay to the Government of the United States; so not a cent of it comes from anybody who has not made excess earnings, because that is what it is made up of entirely—every penny of it. That stands now not drawing interest, not under the law, as I understand, in such condition that a legal suit could be maintained. First, there is work in every one of these instances that I have mentioned and others that I have not mentioned, to which I have only referred. That amounts to some 44 per cent, not quite half. Other railroads owe the balance; and the other railroads the same as these owe it, if they owe a penny, because of excess earnings.

Mr. President, I think when we understand that, even the members of the committee are not going to contest this question any longer. When it is once understood as to just what this is and just what the facts are, there is not any question as to what the duty of the Senate is in the matter.

We are now trying to save money. We are now trying to balance the Budget. We have taxed our people almost beyond the limit of endurance; and here is \$361,000,000 that within a year or two, if this bureau is continued and these experts are continued, will become absolutely due, and from that moment on will draw 6 per cent interest, payable to the Government of the United States.

So it seems to me that we ought unanimously to reach this conclusion—the members of the committee and the others—that with all these facts laid before us there is only one thing to do, and that is to reject the amendment in order that this bureau may continue to ripen into legal effect these amounts that are due the Government of the United States from the railroads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Total, Interstate Commerce Commission, page 29, line 23: Strike out \$7,228,179, and insert \$5,348,560.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, that needs to be corrected to conform to the rejection of the amendment last voted on. I ask unanimous consent that the correction be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to make the correction.

That completes the amendments passed over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to reconsider the amendment with reference to the Radio Commission. I do

not see the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] in the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator let that go over until the Senator from Connecticut returns. I will send for him.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Connecticut said that he did not care to concern himself further about the Federal Radio Commission. Is that the matter the Senator had in mind?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COUZENS. I spoke to the Senator about it this morning. He said he did not care to go into it any further.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if that is the case, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which we adopted these amendments, in order that I may explain to the Senate why, in my opinion, they are not right.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think I called the Senator's attention to the fact that I asked the Senate to do exactly what the Senator from New York is going to ask to be done, and the Senate voted contrary to my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for reconsideration? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 1, strike out "\$399,360" and insert "\$350,000."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask that that sum be changed to \$366,000. This is an increase of \$16,000. At the same time, I ask that on line 5 the sum be decreased from \$20,000 to \$16,000. That makes an increase of \$12,000 in the appropriation; and the purpose of the increase is to provide money for stenographic reporting. They have spent this year \$14,868 for stenographic reporting. They feel that they can do it next year for \$12,000. It must be remembered that the Radio Commission is a judicial body, and its hearings have to be reviewed by the courts, and it is necessary that there should be stenographic reports of these hearings. So if the amount on line 1 is increased to \$366,000, and the amount on line 5 is decreased to \$16,000, there will be provision then for the stenographic reporting.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the Senator's suggestion, because that was the amendment that I asked to have adopted.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I still think these appropriations are excessive, because of the fact that the work of the commission is decreasing all the time, as fast as they dispose of the contests for wave lengths and licenses. It seems to me the item of \$350,000 is quite enough even to include the reporting item which the Senator spoke of, and which I agree is wholly necessary; but I think that can be done well within the \$350,000.

Mr. COPELAND. General Saltzman thinks otherwise, and he has made a strong statement regarding it. I hope the Senator from Michigan will not resist the change.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 1, strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$366,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and remain standing until counted. [A pause.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. If it is permitted before the result of the vote is announced, I should like to say a word on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be restated; and the Senator from Maine is recognized.



Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a point of order. In view of the fact that the committee amendment has already been adopted, how can the motion of the Senator from New York be considered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote was reconsidered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 1, in the committee amendment, the Senator from New York proposes to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$366,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to consult the hearings in connection with this matter; but there are some general considerations in my mind which lead me to doubt the wisdom of the reductions which the committee recommends.

I call to the attention of Senators the fact that under other legislation we are proposing to transfer all of the functions of the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce to this Federal Radio Commission, and that means imposing upon the Federal Radio Commission some substantial duties and obligations not now vested in them by law.

The Radio Division of the Department of Commerce at this time has the responsibility of issuing all of the operators' licenses in the United States, and there are outstanding approximately 37,000 licenses to operators of all classes within this country. That burden, under proposed legislation, is now to be placed upon the Federal Radio Commission.

The Radio Division of the Department of Commerce, as matters now stand, has the responsibility of making all the inspections of radio stations within the United States. They inspect, and have a staff for that purpose, all the land stations within the United States, and all stations upon ships of the United States. That is a burden to be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Federal Radio Commission.

Under existing law, and in pursuance of international treaty, the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce has full responsibility with respect to international accounts arising out of international communications by radio, and that is a troublesome and a burdensome duty, and that, too, is to be transferred to the Federal Radio Commission.

Then, under existing law, the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce publishes from time to time the call letters of every station in the United States. That is a further burden which is to be transferred to the Federal Radio Commission.

We are imposing, therefore, substantial and new burdens upon the Federal Radio Commission, and I have grave doubt, in the light of these added responsibilities, as to whether there is justification for making the reductions which the bill contemplates.

There is another thing which ought not to be overlooked. The coming fall there is to be held abroad the most important international-communications conference that has ever been held. There is to be in Spain a conference dealing with international communications by wire—telephone, telegraph, and cable—and concurrently there is to be held a conference for the revision of the international radio treaty. This international radio treaty makes an allocation, not to nations but to services, of the entire radio spectrum. It says what wave length and what channels may be used for ship-to-shore communication, for ship-to-ship communication, for aircraft communication, for point-to-point communication continentally, for point-to-point communication internationally, and it fixes the broadcasting bands which all the nations of the world must respect.

It occurs to me that within the next year the Federal Radio Commission may have to reorder the entire radio set-up of the United States in order to conform its prior allocations and its prior licenses to the changes which may be worked out in this forthcoming international conference; and if that burden is placed on the commission, it will be a responsibility calling not only for its present personnel, with all the resources now contemplated, but it may place a burden on them which would call for very enlarged personnel and additional resources.

In the light of these transfers of present authority and these possibilities of new burdens, I have the gravest doubt as to the wisdom of reducing at all the appropriations for this commission. Certainly, I concur in the suggestions of the Senator from New York that the appropriations ought to be at least in the amount he suggests.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator recites numerous functions which are being transferred to the Radio Commission from existing service points. Can he tell me whether the appropriations for these existing service points have been reduced to offset the transfers?

Mr. WHITE. I said at the beginning that I had not had a chance to go through the hearings, but I presume they have to some degree at least; but I doubt whether they have to such an extent as to meet these added costs in a new organization. I can not speak with authority as to that, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to the committee amendment.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, now I move to reduce the appropriation in line 5 from \$20,000 to \$16,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was agreed to. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, on Saturday I made a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate agreed to the appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, found on page 30. The Senate approved an appropriation on page 31, line 4, of \$850,000. At that time there was no apparent adequate information as to what that money was to be used for. The Senator from Utah, in answer to a query I made, said that there were 278 employees engaged with that committee. I said that I would not object to the amendment going through, but that I would file a motion to reconsider, and that is the motion I now call up.

Since that time I have received a telegram from Dearborn, Mich., as follows:

My friends in National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics advise me bill comes up this morning relative to appropriation for coming year's appropriations. Government has already given committee fine laboratories and equipment, and I consider committee are doing very fine research job for manufacturers and airplane operators. Although advocating strict Government economy, recommend advisory appropriations be reduced as little as possible.

It was one of the contentions made Saturday that a large part of this appropriation was used for private manufacturers and airplane operators. At the same time it was contended that much of this work was done by the Army and Navy, and as to that I may be in error, because the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] tells me that that is not true, and others have said that there is no duplication.

I have a letter handed me just this moment from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, located in the Navy Building at Washington, signed by the acting chairman. I ask that the clerk may read it, so that their side of the question may be presented at the same time I am presenting mine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read, as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,  
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1932.

Senator JAMES COUZENS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR COUZENS: With reference to your inquiries on the floor of the Senate regarding the work of the National Advisory



Committee for Aeronautics, I beg to submit the following brief statements on the points you raised:

(a) This appropriation is for the conduct of scientific research on the fundamental problems of aeronautics. The War, Navy, and Commerce Departments do not conduct fundamental research in aeronautics, but are represented on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and submit all such problems to the committee. Coordination is thus effectively accomplished and duplication and waste avoided.

(b) The Army and Navy have equal representation on the committee. The committee's headquarters are located in the Navy Building, Washington, and its laboratories at the Army station known as Langley Field, Va. This location of the Government's laboratory for fundamental research in aeronautics was in recognition of the need and advantage of linking laboratory research with flight research, and Langley Field was selected in 1916 by joint agreement of the Army and Navy.

(c) If the committee were discontinued, as was suggested Saturday, it would lead to independent conduct of aeronautical research by at least three other agencies of the Government, instead of one as at present, and would result in inefficiency, duplication, and waste. The continuous prosecution of scientific research on fundamental problems is the most essential constructive activity of the Government in aeronautics to-day and offers the greatest hope for continued improvement in the performance, efficiency, and safety of aircraft.

(d) The committee's work can not be done by the Army and Navy without each building up scientific organizations which they do not now possess; and even then the work under military and naval auspices could not receive the high caliber of scientific direction that is necessary for the best results and that is now afforded by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at a minimum of expense, made possible by the patriotic and devoted service of eminent scientists and aeronautical authorities appointed from private life, who serve on the main committee and on the technical subcommittees without compensation.

If you can spare the time, I beg your indulgence to scan the attached memorandum and some of the extracts from unsolicited comment by authorities in American aeronautics dealing with the work of the committee. I should be happy to furnish any additional information you may desire.

Respectfully,

C. F. MARVIN,

Acting Chairman, Chief United States Weather Bureau.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from Dr. Joseph S. Ames, president of the Johns Hopkins University and chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which he wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee at the beginning of the hearings on this bill in support of the appropriation as it came from the House. The House cut down the original appropriation and the appropriation asked for this year is \$958,310.

This letter is a little too long to read at this time and I will not have it read unless it is desired; but I shall ask unanimous consent that it be printed in connection with the letter just read.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,  
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1932.

Senator HENRY W. KEYES,

Chairman Subcommittee on Independent Offices,  
Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEYES: In support of the appropriation item of \$958,310 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics carried in the independent offices bill I desire briefly to invite attention to the following considerations:

1. Aeronautics is an engineering science and, as in other engineering sciences, progress is dependent upon the continuous prosecution of organized scientific research on the fundamental problems.

2. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is charged by law with the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight. It has 15 members, appointed by the President, and serving as such without compensation. They include 2 representatives each of the Army and Navy air organizations, 1 representative each of the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Smithsonian Institution, and 8 members from private life. Technical subcommittees, similarly organized and kept informed of scientific and technical developments abroad, prepare research programs to meet the needs of all branches of aviation.

3. Aeronautical research is thus effectively coordinated and duplication prevented, as the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments submit their fundamental problems to the committee.

4. Investigations of fundamental problems are conducted under the committee's immediate direction at the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory at Langley Field, Va. This is the world's foremost and best-equipped aeronautical research laboratory. The results of its work are eagerly used by all agencies concerned and in some cases, on request of the Army or Navy, results of unusual military significance are kept secret.

5. Existing research programs are comprehensive in scope and pressing in character. On the results depend largely the efforts of the Army and Navy to keep abreast of military developments abroad, the safety of life and property in the air, and the substantial hope for ultimate realization of the undeveloped possibilities of aircraft as an improved agency of transportation and as a factor of increasing importance in national defense.

6. The Government has spent in connection with aviation during the past five fiscal years, 1927-1931, inclusive, \$647,545,778, including direct expenditures of \$136,301,458 for aircraft, \$63,143,845 for air mail subsidies, \$25,671,619 for air-navigation facilities and air regulation, \$851,580 for the Coast Guard, and \$223,830 for forest-fire patrol. Other expenditures for personnel, construction, maintenance, and operation of stations and carriers, equipment, supplies, helium, ordnance, etc., including antiaircraft artillery totaled during the past five years \$416,978,819. In the face of this vast expenditure and investment, whose ultimate value is so largely dependent upon progress in aeronautics, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the same period spent for scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight less than 1 per cent; that is, \$4,374,577, or 0.68 per cent of the total.

7. The committee's appropriation for 1933 as it passed the House is \$30,000 less than the Budget figure and \$164,760 less than the committee's original estimate. Unless the committee's appropriations are adequate to conduct the necessary fundamental researches in aeronautics in a single coordinated effort for the benefit of all, independent investigations by the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments will inevitably ensue, with resultant duplication in equipment and personnel, which means decreased efficiency and increased cost.

8. The committee's item of \$958,310 as it passed the House represents the minimum amount that will enable the committee to meet the urgent needs of the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments for fundamental information. Any further reduction will lessen the committee's capacity and efficiency, and any material reduction will definitely retard progress in improving the safety and efficiency of aircraft for all purposes.

9. Attention is invited to the statements of the chiefs of the Army and Navy air organizations and of the Director of the Bureau of Standards, as per the inclosed extract from the minutes of a meeting of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics held on March 2, 1932.

Very respectfully,

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,  
JOSEPH S. AMES, Chairman.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF MEETING OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS, MARCH 2, 1932

(Replies of certain members to inquiry by Chairman Ames as to whether anyone knew of duplication of effort in the field of aeronautical research.)

By Rear Admiral W. A. Moffett, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department: "We have no aeronautical research. We are careful to omit even the word 'research' in any of our activities. Our research work is all done by the national advisory committee."

By Brig. Gen. H. C. Pratt, United States Army, chief matériel division, Army Air Corps: "When I first succeeded General Foulis as Chief of the matériel division of the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, I thought there was a great deal of duplication. The average individual would think so. I now find that the matériel division's activities are devoted primarily to engineering experimentation, and I have been unable to find any duplication of its work with that of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics or of any other agency. I think the way the subcommittee of the national advisory committee are organized and function prevents any duplication in aeronautical research."

By Maj. Gen. B. D. Foulis, United States Army, Chief of the Air Corps of the Army: "I support what General Pratt said. I am perfectly willing to state before any committee of Congress that there is no duplication in aeronautical research. The work is very well worked out and coordinated by the committee."

By Dr. George K. Burgess, Director Bureau of Standards: "The Bureau of Standards does only what other agencies request. I know of no duplication."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I hope very much that the motion to reconsider will not prevail. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was formed during the early days of the war, when it became necessary to coordinate the various activities and find out all we could about the fundamental basis of this new science. It has grown in importance from that day to this and has demanded the services of some of the greatest scientists of this country.

On the committee from the beginning has been Orville Wright, the world's first pilot, and the last person to be placed on the committee was Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. On the committee are also representatives of every branch of the Government which deals with aeronautics. They all serve without pay. We have provided for a few offices in the Navy Building, and a very elaborate research laboratory at Langley Field, Va. The station at Langley Field was



built during the war for their use. Later they turned a part of it over to the Army, and on part of the field is the Army's bombing group. The laboratories of the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics contain at this time the world's most important and largest wind tunnel. Recently there has been erected a wind tunnel permitting a full-sized airplane to be tested within the wind tunnel. Most of the wind tunnels are built to accommodate only very small models.

The work which has been done by this committee is of vital importance to aeronautics. It is the fundamental research on which many other advances are made. It is extremely expensive, extremely fundamental, and it takes sometimes four or five years for a problem to be worked out. If the aeronautical industry were in the prosperous condition that the electrical industry has been for the past 15 or 20 years, one might well expect laboratories such as the great research laboratories of the General Electric Co. to help in many of these investigations; but under the circumstances it is absolutely necessary, if American aeronautics are to proceed, that we should not handicap this laboratory in the work it is doing.

One of its functions is to sift out the thousands of plans and designs which are presented to the Government by various inventors and to winnow the wheat from the chaff and find what is worth considering. There are experiments in connection with the necessary strength of the different parts of the airplane wings and of the fuselage of the airplane which have led to differences in construction which have greatly increased the structural strength and design of airplanes. I might, if there were time, mention a great many things they have undertaken. Most of them are of such a highly technical nature that even those who are deeply interested in aeronautics find it difficult to read and understand them. They are of the most vital concern to aeronautical engineers all over the country.

I hope very much, in view of the splendid work that has been done by the committee, that its activities will not be any further curtailed than they have been by the Senate amendment, which, I regret to say, will cause the closing of several of the new buildings at Langley Field because no money is provided in the appropriation to run the new branches of the laboratory. To do what the Senator from Michigan proposes would be a vital blow at the advancement of aviation in this country.

Mr. President, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, during the past five years, has provided at its laboratories at Langley Field, with the support of the Congress, scientific equipment for the study of aeronautical problems that is not equaled anywhere else in the world. Some of this equipment has recently been completed and is just being placed in operation. It is the opinion of the committee that this equipment will play a most important part in the solution of the fundamental problems involved in increasing safety and economy in aircraft operation. I refer in particular to the full-scale wind tunnel, by means of which, for the first time in the history of the world, the scientist is enabled to study under flying conditions the aerodynamic forces affecting the performance characteristics and the control of an airplane. The committee, realizing the difficulty and seriousness of the problems of aviation, foresaw the necessity of providing scientific equipment of a highly specialized nature to hasten the development of aviation.

Although the equipment at the committee's laboratory is unique and the best in the world for the study of the fundamental problems of aviation, there is another important fact to be emphasized, and that is the development of a group of young engineers and scientists especially qualified for the study of the special problems of aeronautics. The wealth of a nation, especially in any industry, is not measured alone by its material resources, but largely by its intellectual development. This is a recognized fact in industry, and practically all large industries at the present time consider research as a form of insurance. They believe that research is essential to continued economic welfare in any industry, and that an industry can not afford to run the unnecessary risk of not providing adequate research laboratories. Re-

search for an industry is like fire insurance for a merchant, and a large, if not the major, portion of the value of a research organization is the wealth of intellectual resources that have been developed in the research laboratory.

Looking at the question from a purely commercial standpoint, the Government has invested a large sum of money in the development of commercial and military aviation, and the amount expended on research is a very small percentage—less than 1 per cent—of this sum to assure the soundness and the future safety of this investment.

With reference to the purchases of the Army and Navy, during the past five fiscal years, from 1927 to 1931, inclusive, the Navy Department expended \$68,492,621.97 for the purchase of aircraft, aircraft engines, and accessories. During the same period the Army Air Corps expended for the same purpose approximately \$67,808,837. This money has been absorbed by the aircraft industry and was used in the development of the industry as it now exists. During the fiscal year 1931 the expenditures of the Navy for new aircraft construction were \$13,819,518.75, and of the Army about \$17,866,252.

In expending this large sum of money, the Government should be assured that the aircraft purchased are up to date, economical, and safe. It is important in the construction of new aircraft that the design include all features that will permit the use of the aircraft as a first-line unit of defense as long as possible. The only way to be certain of this assurance is to provide for the continuous study of those factors that will improve the performance, speed, maneuverability, and safety of military types of aircraft.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics works in close cooperation with the Army Air Corps and the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy. Both these organizations, as a result of their tactical maneuvers, present to the committee for investigation special technical problems, such as those arising from the inadequate performance of an airplane or the failure of structural parts, and these problems are studied by the committee and the results transmitted to the services. This information is made available to the manufacturers, which makes it possible for the designer to incorporate in new designs such features as will prevent the recurrence of failures and provide for greater safety and efficiency in the new types being developed.

The Army Air Corps maintains at Wright Field an experimental station for the study of finished aircraft delivered to the Air Corps to ascertain their suitability for the military requirements of the Air Corps. Tests are made on completed structures and on component parts to see that they fulfill the specifications.

The Bureau of Aeronautics maintains at the naval aircraft factory a similar organization for the structural testing of aircraft and for the performance testing of various types of aircraft engines under all conditions of aircraft operation.

It will be seen from the foregoing statement that the Government is investing a large amount of money, not only in the purchase of military aircraft but also in fostering the development of an aircraft industry in this country. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is designated by law to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution and is authorized to direct and conduct research and experiments in aeronautics in the laboratories placed under its direction. In carrying out these functions the committee keeps in close contact with other governmental agencies so that the problems investigated under its direction reflect the needs of every other Government organization concerned with aeronautics. As a result of this coordination, there is no duplication in the conduct of scientific research in aeronautics. The organization of the committee as an independent establishment, including in its membership and in the membership of its subcommittees representatives of the principal Government agencies concerned with aeronautics, makes possible the pooling of ideas on investigations under the direction of the committee and keeps those responsible for the development of aircraft in the Army and the Navy and for the regulation of air navigation in the



Department of Commerce fully cognizant of each other's problems. By this coordination of ideas and elimination of duplication in the conduct of scientific research in aeronautics, the committee is of the utmost service to all the branches of the Government concerned and to the aircraft industry in the development of the science of aeronautics.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not think I can add anything to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, who is very familiar with aviation and has done a great deal of work, I know, with the National Committee for Aeronautics. Also, I think the letter which was placed in the RECORD in a very fair way by the Senator from Michigan, who makes the motion to reconsider, covers the case very fully.

The work that is done by this committee has to be done in some way. If it is not to be done by the National Advisory Committee, the same work will have to be done by the Army and by the Navy and by the Department of Commerce. This committee brings all three together and cuts down the overhead. I hope very much that the motion of the Senator from Michigan will not prevail.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, this is just another evidence of the rugged individualism we hear so much about in the Nation at this time. We are taught from the throne down to the page boys that we must rely upon "rugged individualism," that there must not be any unification of effort or consolidation of effort even to help the unemployed, because that destroys our individual initiative. And yet we have two of the strongest advocates of "rugged individualism" getting up here in the Senate and indorsing the use of public money to aid in the consolidation of the efforts of airplane manufacturers and operators. If that suggestion came from me, it would be socialism and it would destroy the "rugged individualism" that built up our country.

I merely want to mention the fact that in spite of the letters and the propaganda being sent out by Marshall Field and Du Pont and others, talking about the multiplicity of bureaus, the multiplicity of commissions, how the boards and commissions ought to be disposed of and done away with, yet when we come to touch one that has anything to do with industry, protests arise against effecting an appropriation for that particular board or bureau. That, of course, is statesmanship; but to get up here and plead for what Governor Roosevelt calls "the man in the lower part of the pyramid" is demagoguery. Yet just as soon as we ask to have eliminated from governmental activities those agencies which help to develop business and industry, a loud protest is made.

From my viewpoint, this is a perfectly logical activity; but I resent the suggestion about this kind of activities being the only ones that are statesmanlike and that should be maintained. I am utterly indifferent whether the amendment is reconsidered or not, because, as a matter of fact, we have had an opportunity to show the American public what this "rugged individualism" really means when it comes down to touching those who have and those who have not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is not acquainted with the activities at Langley Field nor with the work done by the committee; otherwise he would not be arguing as he is. A great majority of the work done there—I may say 97 per cent of it—has not been done for manufacturers of aircraft in Dearborn, Mich., or Detroit, or any other place. It has not been done at the request of air-transport companies or of business concerns. Ninety-seven per cent of their activities have been at the request of the Army and Navy in their anxiety to improve the national defense in so far as aviation is concerned and to make it as good as it can possibly be made. That was the object in establishing the committee and that is the chief part of its work.

Incidentally, as always happens when we build up a science for the sake of getting the national defense perfected, we benefit incidentally commercial activities along the same lines; but the Senator must not have the idea that the chief activities of this committee are to benefit commercial aeronautics, because that is not true.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator's own statement, which was in response to a statement I made a while ago, is that it assists the patentees to analyze their work.

Mr. BINGHAM. As offered to the Army and Navy.

Mr. COUZENS. Yes, of course, as long as they are public property they would be of value to private industry, if they were to purchase the patent rights issued under them.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is a board of patents and designs, consisting of the Assistant Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Aeronautics, which considers all offers of patents and designs for purchase by the United States Government for the use of the Army and the Navy. It has nothing to do with the granting of patents, but with the offer of patents if useful for the Army and Navy.

Mr. COUZENS. I understand that, of course. I know they have nothing to do with the issuing of patents. If the patents are valuable, this committee so determines, and, of course, that determination, if it is favorable, is valuable to the patent owner. I understand the situation and the country also understands it, because immediately an objection was made to the appropriation last Saturday it spread all over the country, and protests began to come in from manufacturers and operators who are opposed to the elimination of the item.

I read a telegram from W. B. Mayo, of Dearborn, saying that it would be an injury to the manufacturers of airplanes and they do not want to have it eliminated. I am not concerned with whether the matter is reconsidered or not so long as I have had an opportunity of showing the country what some people mean by "rugged individualism" and what other people mean by it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was not agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call attention to the amendment on page 23, line 7, which has not yet been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 7, strike out "\$83,000" and insert "\$75,000," so as to read:

For all printing and binding for the General Accounting Office, including monthly and annual editions of selected decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States, \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now the amendment in line 8 should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 8, the committee proposes to strike out "\$4,290,820" and insert "\$3,710,000," so as to read:

Total, General Accounting Office, \$3,710,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask the clerk to report the amendment which I offered this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Arkansas offers the following amendment: On page 21, line 22, after the word "act," strike out "\$1,236,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,536,500," so as to read, under the head "Federal Trade Commission," as follows:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each per annum, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including secretary to the commission and other personal services, contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, garage rental, traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$900 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the commission, at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Trade Commission, not to exceed \$300 for newspapers, foreign postage, and witness fees, and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, \$1,536,500,

And so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an increase in the total for the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is an increase of \$300,000 in the appropriation for personal services in the



District of Columbia. May I say that during the current year the Federal Trade Commission has had available \$1,751,766 and that the amount carried in the House text is \$1,236,500, representing a reduction of 29.4 per cent over the current year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think this is one of the most important items in the bill, and I hope the Senator will yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am afraid we could not get a quorum at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this matter has been called to my attention, and I rather think the Senator's proposal is all right. I am willing to accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will be necessary to have certain totals corrected because of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. We already have a unanimous-consent agreement that the clerks shall correct the totals where necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. On page 22, line 1, and on page 22, line 7, it will be necessary that the totals shall be corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerks will correct all totals.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to a letter which I have received from Mr. Morrow, of the Board of Mediation. Has this matter been called to the attention of the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. It has.

Mr. HATFIELD. From the statement made by this member of the Board of Mediation regarding the reductions made in 1931 and coming down to the present time as to the amount of money allowed the board, taking into consideration the great amount of work to be done and what it has been able to accomplish between employer and employee, I am convinced that Mr. Morrow's contentions are right. I am wondering what the Senator is willing to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as long as we have a number of these things and they have all been brought up we might as well take this to conference. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to may be reconsidered. I refer to the amendment on page 7, beginning in line 7, down to and including the word "boards," in line 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, under "Board of Mediation," the committee proposed to strike out "\$151,135" and insert the following:

\$115,000, and in addition thereto there is hereby reappropriated and made available for this purpose for the fiscal year 1933, \$30,000 of the combined unexpended balances of the appropriations for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931 for arbitration and emergency boards.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was agreed to. Is there objection to a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask now that we disagree to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the letter to which I referred from the Board of Mediation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES BOARD OF MEDIATION,  
Washington, June 27, 1932.

HON. HENRY D. HATFIELD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Through evident mistake and total misapprehension, the Senate is about to destroy the Board of Mediation, which is the only means of keeping orderly procedure in railway labor disputes. The Senate, on June 24, on recommendation of Senator Smoot, cut \$30,000 from the appropriation of the Board

of Mediation. The Senator said this cut was made because "it is provided for in another place." This is a clear mistake since there is no provision made for it in any other place.

I inclose brief statement of cuts made which will show you at a glance that some mistake must have been made. The \$30,000 must be restored if the board is to have any available funds to send its men into the field where labor disputes occur and where they must, and can alone, be settled. A cut of \$30,000 will destroy the Board of Mediation, which has, from its inception, prevented strikes in the entire railroad world and settled hundreds of disputes which threatened to interrupt interstate commerce.

Both the railroads and the employees know that this board can not operate unless this mistake is corrected, and they want it corrected.

This matter must be acted upon before the Senate disposes of the appropriation bill which it is considering at this moment.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN P. MORROW,  
Member, Board of Mediation.

United States Board of Mediation

		Step-by-step reduction	Total reduction
Allotment for 1931-32.....	\$188,185		
Board of Mediation estimate for 1932-33.....	180,665	\$1,520	
Budget estimate and allowance to Congress.....	169,865	16,800	\$18,320
House appropriation bill (H. R. 10022).....	152,135	17,730	36,050
Senate proposal (June 24, Congressional Record, p. 13860).....	116,000	36,135	72,185

NOTE.—The above figures show a reduction of \$72,185 which would be taken away from \$188,185, which, on its face, should demonstrate that the proposed cut is beyond all reason and that the Board of Mediation can not function under such a cut.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, after the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas on page 21, line 22, it seems to me that we shall have also to add "\$300,000" to line 1 on page 22.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have just had that done.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well; I did not know that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That correction has been made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. An order has also been made for the correction of the total on line 7.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but this is not in the total.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have also had that done. That was done, was it not, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk has been authorized to make the necessary changes in the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask may be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be available for the maintenance of a sea service bureau.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in previous independent offices appropriation bills for a number of years I have secured the adoption of this limitation amendment. In each case, however, the amendment has gone out in conference. In the consideration of the bill immediately preceding the one now under consideration the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], on behalf of the committee, offered a similar amendment to the one I now offer, and it was adopted.

For the information of the Senate, I desire to say that the sea service bureau was organized during the World War by the Shipping Board when it was operating a tremendous fleet of vessels. It was, in fact, a recruiting agency for the Emergency Fleet Corporation vessels. It has been maintained, Mr. President, in spite of the fact that all the functions which that bureau has discharged since the war are being performed by the United States shipping commissioners.

I wish to invite attention to the report of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, to be found on page 643 of the House hearings on the pending bill, in which this sentence occurs:

In view of this specific assignment of duty there seems to be no justification for the assumption of this work by the Shipping Board.



I also wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a statement made by Representative DAVIS, of Tennessee, to be found on page 655 of the hearings, which is as follows:

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I know you are naturally seeking means by which you may effect reductions, and I want to make a suggestion by which you can make a saving without embarrassing any useful activity of the Government, by getting rid of an old war hold-over.

During the World War, when we were carrying on a tremendous ship-building and ship-purchasing program, and putting the ships into service, which resulted finally in the Government putting 2,500 ships into service, they were naturally confronted with a very serious need of seamen.

There were not enough seamen available to man the ships, so they established a sea service bureau for the purpose of recruiting and, in a sense, training seamen.

That is not mentioned in any statute, but the Fleet Corporation is still maintaining that same service, although all the Shipping Board lines except nine have been disposed of, and this sea service bureau is simply duplicating the service as specifically authorized by law to be performed by the shipping commissioners.

The shipping commissioners are under the United States Commissioner of Navigation, specifically authorized by law, and their duties are defined. Those duties are to register seamen and to certify them to sail on American vessels.

There is a shipping commissioner in every port and everywhere that a sea service bureau is, as well as at places where there are no sea service bureau offices.

Mr. President, it was indicated in the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee that \$91,460 would be needed in order to continue the sea service bureau.

In view of the fact that the need for this bureau has disappeared with the war emergency, in view of the fact that the United States shipping commissioners are charged under the law with responsibility for performing all the service which the sea service bureau is performing, and in view of the further fact that the Senate has repeatedly gone on record by its action in favor of the abandonment of this bureau and the elimination of this expenditure, it does seem to me that at a time when efforts are being made toward economy, the Senate conferees should stand up and fight for this amendment, if it shall be adopted at this time, which I hope it may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, on Saturday last I gave notice of an intention to move a reconsideration of the action by which the Senate reduced the amount available for the Federal Farm Board to \$600,000. Before moving to reconsider, I am going now to ask the Senator from Utah whether he will accept an amendment that would restore the amount to \$1,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. What is the Senator's amendment?

Mr. NYE. The Senate on Saturday limited the amount of available balances that could be expended by the Farm Board for the ensuing fiscal year to \$600,000, which compared with \$1,800,000 which was made available to the board last year. A request for a million dollars, it seems to me, is only in keeping with fair play, in view of the original recommendation of the committee and of the result which would follow if the Senate were to accept \$600,000 as the limit to be expended by the Farm Board.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, conforming with what we have done in two or three other cases, I shall accept the amendment, so far as I am concerned, if there is no objection by any other Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I stated Saturday and I say again—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to state my view—

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I merely said, that, so far as I was concerned, I would accept the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona in his own right.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to clear my own record so far as I may on this Farm Board matter.

When the original bill to create the Farm Board was before the Senate, I was warned by men of sagacity and judgment not to vote for it, and when the proposal to appropriate \$500,000,000 for the Farm Board came before the Senate I was again warned not to vote for it.

Mr. President, we find that the Federal Farm Board has spent \$499,000,000. Will some Senator please tell me where that money is; what the Farm Board did with it; what has become of it?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I assume the Senator is asking the question for information.

Mr. ASHURST. It is due to the Senate and to the country that there should go into the RECORD a complete statement as to what became of this huge sum of Federal money, \$500,000,000, derived from taxes paid by the people. I think there should go into the RECORD a statement why the Federal Farm Board permitted one official, as I am reliably informed, to draw a salary of over \$50,000 per year.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I do not want to interrupt the enlightening remarks of the Senator from Arizona, but the statement that the Federal Farm Board had allowed any official of the Farm Board to receive \$50,000 is not correct. The salary of that amount, which was paid, was paid by a cooperative association which was financed by the Farm Board.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well; the salary was paid, then, by a cooperative with the permission or the knowledge of the Farm Board.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. And the \$50,000 a year which was paid to that official came out of the farmers whose annual income did not exceed \$300 a year in cash.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I am quite in accord with the Senator's position on that question.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well; so much for that.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator is not quite accurate in his statement.

Mr. ASHURST. I beg the Senator to believe that I desire to be corrected.

Mr. BROOKHART. I will correct the Senator in one respect, as I was at the hearing and remember the facts. The salary paid in the case to which reference was made where farmers were receiving \$300 a year was not \$50,000 but was \$75,000, and was paid in connection with a cotton cooperative association. The \$50,000 salary was paid by a cooperative association of wheat farmers, and in that case the official receiving the salary was manager of two corporations, the Stabilization Corporation and the National Grain Marketing Corporation, and he testified that on a certain day he would be buying wheat for one of these corporations of which he was general manager, and on the very same day selling wheat for the other corporation of which he was a general manager, making it a wash-sale operation of the rankest kind. Then perhaps the very next day that would be reversed and the other one of those corporations would be buying and the other selling.

Mr. ASHURST. I am glad to be corrected on that point.

It may suggest itself to Senators that I ought not to be particularly interested in the operations of the Farm Board. Arizona produces cotton and wheat, and for that reason has a legitimate interest in the operations of the Federal Farm Board; but even if the State of Arizona did not produce a bale of cotton or a bushel of wheat I would not find it to comport with my duty to sit silent while an effort was being made to grant the Farm Board an additional sum of money until we know what became of the \$500,000,000.



Senators should read the speech of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] on Saturday last, beginning on page 13970 of the RECORD and extending over some pages.

I shall surrender the floor to any Senator who will give an explanation and an accounting of what happened to this \$500,000,000 of the people's revenues and who will give a reason why we should grant to the Federal Farm Board another \$1,000,000. A Senator telephoned officials of the Farm Board the other day and asked them what was their unexpended balance. On the telephone he was informed that it was a certain amount. A further investigation, however, disclosed that the Farm Board official did not know how much their own unexpended balance was, and it developed to be a higher sum, thereby convincing some, at least, that either the official who responded by telephone did not know how much was the unexpended balance or attempted to deceive the Senate.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. I am sure the Senator from Arizona would not want to do any injustice to anyone connected with the Farm Board or any other board. The understanding is that when the request was made by a member of the Committee on Appropriations for information as to the unexpended balance the officials of the Farm Board assumed that the balance as to which information was requested was the balance of the 1932 appropriation, because the records were here in the Senate and in the committee revealing what balances there were from previous years. The information was quickly given as to the balance of the 1932 appropriation; but as soon as the chairman of the Farm Board understood that there was a misunderstanding here with respect to that statement, I am advised he carefully informed one member of the committee that he had not given an accounting of all the unexpended balances, but only the unexpended balance for one year, and he stated that the balances for the previous years had already been accounted for.

Mr. ASHURST. I accept that statement.

Now, Mr. President, I am not going to, and I do not think I have up to date, charged that any member of the Farm Board himself corruptly or dishonestly used any of this money. I do not charge that. What I want explained, and I think I have a right to the explanation, is, what became of the \$499,000,000? What good came to the farmers of the United States from the expenditure of \$499,000,000?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Arizona, in his request for information, is entitled to all of the information that may be available.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Just a moment, please. I have seen no inclination on the part of the Federal Farm Board to deny to anybody—any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House—information as to what was done with the \$500,000,000 that was made available to the Farm Board; and I am going to be very, very brief in reciting just what was done with that money.

In less than three years of operation by the Farm Board, the Farm Board has made loans of \$985,295,427.24 from this so-called revolving fund of \$500,000,000. Of that amount there has been repaid \$516,069,688.66, leaving a balance unpaid of \$469,225,738.58.

That unpaid balance is divided as follows:

Owing the Farm Board by the cooperative associations that have borrowed from the Farm Board or from the revolving fund, \$166,172,488.49.

The stabilization loans left unpaid are \$303,053,250.09.

Those two items, combined with a balance of \$30,774,261.42, account for the \$500,000,000 revolving fund which was appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood in asking for a restoration of a larger amount of appropriation this year than was provided by the Senate committee, for I am just as severe a critic, I believe, as is the Senator from Arizona of some of the practices of the Federal Farm Board.

I think there is a great deal that the board has done and has not done that merits criticism. However, I think we are very unjust if we proceed now—and I am delighted to note that the Senator from Utah is ready to concede the point and to afford a sufficient amount to enable the board to carry on—I think it would be a terrible mistake on our part if we were to destroy the Farm Board by starving it to death in the appropriations of this year, particularly in view of the fact that the Senate has instructed the Agricultural Committee to make an investigation into the activities of the Federal Farm Board and the activities as well of those influences that are engaged in undermining and trying to destroy the Farm Board. Until we have the results of that investigation I ask the Senator from Arizona in all frankness if it is not better that we continue to enable to Farm Board to carry on for the ensuing year and await any repeal action or any action that would completely destroy the farm marketing act and the Farm Board until we have the results of that investigation?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if any class of the people of the United States require governmental encouragement, the farmer does. His condition is such that his profits are very meager, if he ever receives any at all. I am moved because of my disappointment that the Farm Board, with \$500,000,000 at its command, has done, so far as I can see, so little. Wheat is lower than when the Farm Board took charge.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the cooperatives that have handled grain particularly will not agree with the Senator that nothing has been accomplished.

Mr. ASHURST. Measured by results alone, I should say that the Farm Board does not justify its own existence. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. NYE. I yield; certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. There is some force in the suggestion that we ought not to starve the board out of existence. That would not comport with my idea of fighting. I do not want to starve it out of existence. I should like to vote it out of existence openly, manfully.

If those who represent the wheat and cotton States believe, as they appear to, that this Farm Board could, with another million dollars, be of assistance to the farmer, I shall not consume much time; but I shall vote "no," and I desire that the country, so far as it deigns to pay attention to what I say, and the Senate shall know that I do not intend to share any more responsibility for the reckless and relentless actions of the Federal Farm Board.

I heard the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and I think he had a definite understanding that the Senate was not going to increase the appropriation beyond the \$600,000. I hope the Senate will not grant more than the \$600,000 to the Farm Board.

Mr. NYE. I am going to move that it be limited to \$1,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. REED. It seems to me this is wholly unfair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. He made a very vigorous argument on Saturday in favor of the \$600,000 limitation. He convinced everybody who heard him, I think.

Mr. ASHURST. He convinced me.

Mr. REED. He certainly convinced me. He pointed out that the Farm Board is maintaining a most expensive bureau of agricultural economics, which is wholly unnecessary, because a similar bureau is maintained in the Department of Agriculture—

Mr. ASHURST. Quite so.

Mr. REED. And that the two are doing the same thing at the same time, in the same town, for the same Government, duplicating work with a totally unnecessary expense.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] had to go away, and here in his absence, after he has carried his point, we are moving to rescind his action. It will not go to conference at all, because if this amount is increased to



\$1,000,000 it will agree with the action of the House on the subject, and the conferees will have no power to act.

I rather dissent from the statement of the Senator that the Senators from the agricultural States, the grain and cotton States, all regard the Farm Board as a blessing. A great many of them have convinced me that the Farm Board is the principal trouble to-day with the price of wheat and cotton; that if it were not for those great stocks overhanging the market in the hands of the Farm Board, the natural working of economic forces would bring about higher prices for both of those commodities. Maybe that is not so. I am no agricultural expert. I do not know, but I am impressed by the number of former advocates of the Farm Board who have come to think that, and to think that the Farm Board has done more harm and is at this minute doing more harm to the farmer than it ever did him any good.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. I do know of my own knowledge, on top of that, that somewhere, down some rat hole, has gone \$500,000,000 of money that we took from American taxpayers who paid it with the utmost difficulty.

Mr. ASHURST. I am, of course, delighted to have the support of the able Senator from Pennsylvania upon this point.

I do not pretend to be a practical agriculturist or farmer, and I draw conclusions as the Senator from Pennsylvania has drawn them. We were promised many things, and, as the Senator from Pennsylvania with cameolike distinctness says, the net result is that \$500,000,000 has gone down some place, nobody knows where.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Just an observation.

In answer to the \$500,000,000 that so much has been said about, I desire to say that the Farm Board authorized the setting up of stabilization corporations; and immediately upon the signing of the act by the President and the organization of the board the Members of Congress from wheat States, Senators and Members of the House, both moved in on the Farm Board and insisted that the wheat market be stabilized. The same thing happened with cotton; and the Farm Board, at the urgent request of Members of Congress from both the wheat States and the cotton States, insisted that they buy this wheat and cotton. They have bought it, and they have made the loss.

Now, I am not making any defense of the Farm Board at all. Maybe they did right and maybe they did wrong; but I do think Congress ought to take part of the blame, because certainly this act was at the urgent request of Members from cotton States and from wheat States.

Part of the \$500,000,000 has been lost as a result of this kind of an operation, and one hundred and fifty or two hundred million dollars has been loaned to cooperative associations that is not lost. The Farm Board considered them good loans, actually made under the direction and authorization of the board; so the \$500,000,000 is not lost. It may be expended. The report shows that they had some fifty-odd million dollars on hand when this report was made. Forty million bushels of wheat were taken and given to the Red Cross without compensating the Farm Board for it.

The members of the Farm Board are earnest, honest representatives of the different branches of agriculture. They are doing the best they can. Congress authorized them to do these things, and I think we ought to give them at least a square deal. You hamstring them when you cut this appropriation from \$1,750,000 down to \$600,000. In justice to the Farm Board, I think that until the investigation has been made, until we have finally considered what we ought to do with the board, we ought at least to give them enough money to operate on.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] has the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Several times this afternoon during the discussion of this subject reference has been made to an investigation as if it had been authorized. Has the Senate authorized an investigation of the Federal Farm Board's expenditures?

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. By resolution, the Senate has authorized the Agricultural Committee to make a complete investigation of the Farm Board.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Has the committee taken any action under the resolution?

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. The actual investigation has not been started. The chairman of the committee is not present in the chamber. I might say that he advises me that just as soon as Congress adjourns, so that he can have time to give it attention, he expects to inaugurate a very searching investigation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is the investigation to be made by the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or by a subcommittee?

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I can not advise the Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield further to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have had some information that it is proposed that this investigation shall be stifled; and it seems to me that now is a very good time to ascertain whether or not that is true.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ASHURST. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Idaho has misunderstood me. I did not mean to put the blame for this mess upon the individuals who compose the Farm Board. I agree with the Senator from Idaho; the blame is principally upon Congress. I, for one, want to say that I voted for the conference report in which the Farm Board was created, and I am more ashamed of that vote than of any I have cast in the 10 years since I have been in the Senate. I accept my share of the blame.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to make this suggestion, that a lot of us voted for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, and that corporation has been attempting to do exactly the same thing for a lot of business institutions and financial institutions that the Farm Board attempted to do for the farming interests of this country, and the statement that we are just shoveling this money down a rat hole is absolutely unfair and should not go unchallenged on the Senate floor. As a matter of fact, the Farm Board was established at a time when the whole world was going into an economic decline. I want to know what banker there is in the United States who wants his reputation as a banker judged by what has happened to his financial institution in the last three years. I want to know what Senator there is who wants his record as a Senator judged by how he has been able to meet the demands of the correspondence that comes into his office. I want to say, Mr. President, that we are not able to meet it legislatively. The present economic depression does not affect only one line, it affects every line; and to come here and say we need a Reconstruction Finance Corporation for business and then that we ought to strangle the Farm Board because of the activities they have carried on the past two years is simply petting one interest and punishing another interest of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Frankly, I do not understand the statement just made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]. So far as I know, the Reconstruction



Finance Corporation is not involved in this amendment. The amendment has no relation whatever either to the powers or the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In just a moment. It is true that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been created and that its operations have not been as successful as the proponents of the measure establishing it hoped they would be. But does the Senator from Iowa think that the operations of the Federal Farm Board, in the stabilization of wheat and cotton, have been fairly effective? Does he feel that they have justified the hopes we all had when we voted for the creation of the Federal Farm Board and gave it the very large fund we appropriated for its use?

Frankly, Mr. President, I have been unable to see the benefits of the stabilization policy of the Federal Farm Board. I have been unable to comprehend its recommendation for the destruction of crops already produced—of one-third of the cotton crop, for instance—as the best means of raising prices and of solving the surplus problem.

Undoubtedly our times are characterized by the existence of numerous problems, some of them new, some of them presenting new aspects; but to me it is not a complete vindication of the Federal Farm Board to say that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has not worked well. It is rather begging the question.

I yield now, with the permission of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I want to make this suggestion: I did not say that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had not accomplished the purposes for which we had appropriated the money. The thing I have in mind is that we attempted to do exactly for business through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation what we attempted to do for agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The entire implication of the Senator's declaration was that a failure comparable to that which has attended the efforts of the Federal Farm Board has marked the labors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. His argument could have no other significance. I am not posing as the champion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am going to surrender the floor now.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I wish to close in a moment.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Iowa wished to find a parallel to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which lends money on adequate security to banks and similar institutions, he might find it in the various agricultural credit establishments which we have set up. He will not find in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation anything like the economic folly of buying the output of any particular type of producer and carrying it at Government risk, which is what we have done in the Farm Board and its affiliated cooperatives. There is a declining market, the Government has incurred a huge risk, and to-day the producers of the country, suffering from the desperate crop shortage of winter wheat, are confronted with the lowest price in history.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in conclusion, the able Senator from Pennsylvania said he was willing, and other Senators have said they were willing, to assume and share their part of the blame for the creation of the Federal Farm Board. I fancy when I apply introspection to myself that I am a little sensitive about the vote I cast, because I have been most severely criticized all over the State of Arizona for that vote, and therefore possibly I show an undue degree of animation. But so far as sharing the blame is concerned, I seek to avoid none of the responsibility for the vote I cast. I cast it in good faith; and if any Senator feels that any part of the blame is irksome to him, I will bear his share also. I am not seeking to avoid any part of the blame or responsibility for that vote.

Since it can not be corrected, surely we can ascertain what they have done, what good has been accomplished, what they purpose doing with additional moneys. It is a good rule in life when you trust a man with a huge sum of money and get disappointing results not to trust him with smaller sums, even. That is all I care to say, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an answer in defense of the Federal Farm Board by the Hon. W. F. Schilling, of Minnesota, to an editorial in the Minneapolis Journal. Everyone who reads this article can readily see who is the farmers' friend—the Minneapolis Journal and the private grain gamblers or the Federal Farm Board.

There being no objection, Mr. Schilling's article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Journal, June 26, 1932]

SCHILLING DEFENDS FARM BOARD; ASKS LONGER TRIAL OF ITS PLAN—POINTS TO DECLINES IN OTHER COMMODITIES AND IN SECURITIES—DECLARES FARMERS HAVE FARED BETTER COMPARATIVELY—DENIES GRAIN TRADE COULD PREVENT LOSSES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL:

I do not like the editorial in your paper of the 25th of May entitled, "The Futile Farm Board." It is not fair to the farmers of this country; it is not fair to the men who worked so hard to find a way out for the farmer; it is not fair to the Congress that passed the marketing act; it is not fair to the board; and, lastly, and of as much importance, it is not fair to the thousands of citizens of the Northwest, who are in a sad state because agriculture is not now and has not for many years been getting a square deal.

The first paragraph of your editorial reads:

"The Farm Board wants a hundred million dollars from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's credit pool placed at the disposal of cashless and presumably creditless foreign customers so that they can buy the board's surplus wheat."

In fairness to your readers you should have told them that the international bankers of this country loaned these creditless foreign governments over \$14,000,000,000 before the board came into being, taking the credit away from the American farmers so as to get a better rate of interest and to have their finances "liquid."

The result of this is that the Government had to come to the rescue of the bankers, the railroads, and the insurance companies to the tune of the \$2,000,000,000 Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Now, we farmers are not saying a word about this, because if it helps the banks and others, maybe it will help us a bit. That is the Government's "stabilization" effort for industry, and no one doubts for a moment that some of this money will be lost. One railroad man has already said that the Government was saving the banks and buying the railroads. Why do you not in The Journal say something about this program while criticizing the Government's efforts in loaning money to assist the farmers' cooperative associations? Both are "cooperative." On the one hand, men engaged in industry cooperate to get better results from their capital and labor, and on the other the farmers are doing it.

Then you go on with:

"The Strong bill, now in Congress, would in effect grant this request. American taxpayers, already out the greater part of half a billion dollars because of the board's fantastic grain and cotton operations, would be left holding the bag for another hundred million. The growers of wheat would be helped no more by the disposal of the surplus under this plan than by its disposal in any other way that did not break the market."

I am sure the taxpayers of the country will not have occasion to complain of Government expenditure of money to save agriculture any more than they would to save industry, for the farmers have never had, and do not now have, anywhere near the advantages that industry has in getting Government funds to support it.

SAYS BOARD HELPED HOLD WHEAT PRICES

I am quite sure that under ordinary times and conditions, and with a few years' experience, the marketing of wheat and other commodities might be carried on to better advantage; for we farmers were laboring under the handicap of competing with old-line companies that had played the game for well onto 50 years; and while some of these men helped to write the marketing act, they immediately set out to kill its effectiveness by engaging in one of the most gigantic propaganda exhibitions detrimental to its use ever put on in this country.

But what has happened? Wheat, so badly handled, is to-day practically without exception the only commodity, either agricultural or industrial, that has shown any improvement in price during the past 11 months. If you are familiar with the markets, you will see that because of orderly marketing the domestic price has been from 5 to 15 cents above the world market price parity.

The Grain Stabilization Corporation possesses only about a quarter of the surplus wheat; and if the speculators want to do a real service to the farmers of the country, why do they not experiment for a time on the other three-fourths and "market them at an advanced price," as has been suggested?

Why would it not be advisable for you to suggest also that the private interests, which once handled practically all the butter



that was made in Minnesota, should take over the large holdings of dairy products now possessed by the big Land O'Lakes cooperative organization. Do you know that in Minnesota the first real effort was made to make high-quality butter and, further, that the Land O'Lakes organization is the first institution to put a quality product on the market in a national way and that, instead of a few commission merchants handling the product of your city, you now have several hundred employees on a steady pay roll making, wrapping, and marketing in a manner never before heard of until Land O'Lakes was established. And it is truly cooperative.

This system of marketing gave the farmers of Minnesota in and out of that organization 1.98 cents per pound for butter more than they ever received for it, based upon the New York price quotations.

Do you recall only 16 years ago that I and four other farmers were under indictment in the city of Minneapolis for forming a cooperative milk organization, and would you be so unwise as to suggest that the 8,000 farmers that are now members of that institution should go back to their former way of handling their product? I am sure you would not. And please remember the condemnation we had at that time.

#### CITES DECLINES IN OTHER COMMODITIES

Would you even surmise that the handling of grain cooperatively, after 50 years of the other method, should run along smoothly under conditions and in times such as were never heard of before by the oldest operator? If you do, then you certainly are not familiar with conditions as they are.

What about the price of butter, eggs, and dairy products? Why do not the "friends of the farmers" try their hands in these commodities? Surely they represent many times the interest and wealth represented in wheat.

I am quoting you herewith tables representing price declines of agricultural commodities and also common-stock price indexes. These tables are taken from Standard Statistics and are presumably correct:

TABLE 1.—Price declines of agricultural commodities

Commodity	Price September, 1929	Price May 18, 1932	Per cent. decrease
Wheat, No. 2 hard winter, Kansas City.....	\$1.240	\$0.52	58.1
Cotton, New Orleans, spot.....	.1845	.0574	68.9
Butter, 92 score, New York.....	.460	.18	60.9
Cheese, single daisies, Chicago.....	.227	.1075	52.6
Wool.....	.930	.495	46.8

TABLE 2.—Common-stock price indexes  
[1926 equals 100]

Stocks	High, 1929	May 18, 1932	Per cent. decrease
404 stocks combined.....	228.1	39.2	82.81
337 industrials.....	218.9	37.7	82.78
33 rails.....	173.5	16.6	90.43
34 utilities.....	330.4	66.5	79.87
Industrial groups:			
Autos (including General Motors).....	294.4	29.5	89.98
General Motors.....	397.3	45.5	88.55
Chemicals.....	345.6	51.2	85.19
Copper and brass.....	344.1	20.8	93.96
Electrical equipment.....	419.0	51.1	87.80
Radio.....	765.5	26.3	96.56
Steel (including United States Steel).....	255.0	25.5	90.00
United States Steel.....	265.7	29.2	89.01
Electric, gas, water, etc., holding companies.....	468.1	52.8	88.72
Electric, gas, water, etc., operating companies.....	338.4	91.9	72.84
New York City banks.....	297.4	45.1	88.65

TABLE 3.—Price declines of bank stocks

Stock	Price September, 1929	May 24, 1932, price	Per cent. decrease
First Bank stock, St. Paul and Minneapolis.....	\$64.50	\$7.38	88.56
Northwest Banco Corporation, Minneapolis.....	99.75	10.50	89.48

Of course, I appreciate that agricultural prices have met a terrible tumble in the depression, and it may be that the Farm Board has been somewhat of a Jonah; but surely you missed the chance of a lifetime that you did not also state that the stock-market manipulations should be turned over to the Farm Board, for the record of this board in the interest of agriculture is a vast improvement on the operations in the stock market in behalf of industry. Many a creamery has been saved by this board where their all is frozen solid in closed banks.

I will grant, for the sake of argument, that the board is not perfect and has made mistakes. Why should it be perfect? Did it have any pattern to go by? It has undertaken a gigantic task with the entrenched grain trade, with vast experience, resources, and press propaganda fighting cooperative marketing to the last ditch. It was all well and good and nothing happened as long

as the country farmers' elevator acted as a field agent for the grain trade and turned its products over to the terminals where the profits were.

#### DENIES EXCHANGES WOULD HELP FARMER

I want to ask the readers of the Journal if they do not remember 16 years ago when the Twin City Milk Producers Association was formed what happened. The old-line handlers of milk had us farmers arrested and put under indictment in Hennepin County for forming a "gigantic milk trust for the purpose of raising the price of milk to starve the women and children." We were just trying to get a square deal, as the farmers are now in other commodities.

You further state:

"Why, in the name of common sense, should Uncle Sam throw good money after bad to enable the Farm Board to get rid of Government wheat when experts in the grain trade can do the job for him at no cost at all?"

Experts in the grain trade might do this at no cost to the Government, but what about the cost to the farmers of America? What about the cost to the farmers if they turn this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat over to the grain trade, after paying carrying and storage charges and all on it since the last crop, and, with a short crop in sight, it would be a beautiful picture to see them take the cooperatives' grain mingled with three times as much? In the face of a rising market they could easily make back the profits that have been denied them the past two years, but the farmer would not be in a very good frame of mind when this had happened.

Why is Mr. Carey so interested in selling Farm Board wheat when there is three times that much in other hands that he might sell "for the benefit of farmers"?

Again, your editorial states:

"But men who know the grain business from the inside out (in contrast with the Farm Board's favorites who apparently know little about anything except making big promises and cashing fat salary checks) say they can sell this surplus wheat, and for spot cash, while the market, instead of breaking, actually advances. Why should not Congress take the matter clear out of the board's hands and give the grain men the chance?"

If the men who know the grain trade from "inside out" have been doing such a good job of marketing the farmer's wheat there would have been no excuse whatsoever for the marketing act and farmers would be content and happy now, instead of in a condition that imperils that stability of our whole economic structure. The grain men have had their chance and your reference to fat salary checks is one that is amusing, to say the least.

#### DEFENDS SALARIES PAID FARM BOARD

If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find that when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up to assist the banks, the railroads, and insurance companies, some "indiscreet" Congressman suggested that inasmuch as the grain trade wanted to limit organizations borrowing from the Farm Board to salaries of \$15,000 a year that the same restriction should apply to organizations obtaining loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. But it was soon discovered that there were no borrowers in that line who had their executive receiving such paltry sums as \$15,000 and consequently, after trying hard to fix a limit up to \$50,000, or even \$75,000 and \$100,000, Congress threw up its hands and let it go wild.

It would be interesting for the Journal to print the salaries and commissions of the leading grain men in this country who handled half as much grain as the Farmers' National side by side with the Farmers' National employees so that the farmers might get the truth in this matter.

I can not understand why such a splendid publication as the Minneapolis Journal could be content to print but one side of this story and expect the farmers of the Central Northwest to be content with such propaganda. Such work as this forebodes trouble.

Witness, please, your story of May 30, under the caption "Board Wrecked Wheat Growers, Paper Charges, Cooperative Farmer Attacks Federal Agency, Cites Failure and Promises." Why don't you state that this Cooperative Manager and Farmer from which you quote is a Minneapolis publication printed in the interests of the grain trade, and has no semblance whatsoever of farmer cooperation in its make-up? What did the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in its May term, 1926, on petition to review on order of the Federal Trade Commission in Equity Cooperative Exchange case, say, relative to this publication:

"That the respondent manager publication company is a corporation publishing a grain trade paper (the Cooperative Manager and Farmer), which circulates in the trade territory tributary to Minneapolis, and respondents, John H. Adams and John F. Fleming, are stockholders therein and editors thereof."

In its report of December 28, 1923, the Federal Trade Commission said, in so many words, that the policy of this publication was dictated by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Its exact language was:

"The policy of the Cooperative Manager and Farmer during all of said time was dominated and controlled by the secretary of the respondent chamber of commerce to furnish the data and material for a great number of articles for the policy hereinafter described."

Isn't it too bad to mislead and deceive honest cooperative farmers by having the word "cooperative" attached to a publication of this kind?



## POINTS TO CONDITION OF TOBACCO MARKET

The Cooperative Manager and Farmer is the same to-day as it was, as J. F. Fleming is editor and general manager, and one, W. D. Fleming, is associate editor. This paper is filled with advertisements of grain dealers and grain commission men, and it is quite natural that every issue it puts out is teeming with anti-Farm Board propaganda, for it realizes that when farmers market their own grain, as is contemplated by the marketing act, its usefulness will be very limited.

The last paragraph of your editorial:

"The Farm Board, which originally set out to keep wheat prices up in the face of a bearish supply and demand situation, has succeeded only in keeping wheat prices down in the face of a bullish supply and demand situation."

As stated above, the stabilization stocks of wheat are only one-quarter of the surplus supply and it has been marketed on a basis of 5,000,000 bushels a month, which every grain man knew about. This being the case, why did not the operators in the grain trade push up the price on the wheat they had in this bullish situation, or were they afraid that the grain held in the Stabilization Corporation would immediately follow along up and the price situation work out to the credit of the Stabilization Corporation?

Speaking of "supply and demand," it would be interesting to have some of those who have been harping along on that string to witness what is going on in the tobacco trade at the present time. In the face of the largest supply of tobacco ever known in this country and a price to the tobacco growers down to the starvation point, the manufacturers of cigarettes have, within the past year, raised the price of their product and one manufacturer has made a profit of \$36,000,000, while the entire crop of Burley tobacco was bought from the farmers at only \$35,000,000.

I do not believe that many farmer readers of the Journal realize that men high up in the councils of the grain trade had more to do with the framing of the agricultural marketing act than did the farmers themselves, and it seems too bad at this time, when farmers and others are all in such dire need, that the marketing act should be blamed for so much of the distress that is visited upon agriculture and others. Is the marketing act responsible for the loss of \$2,800,000,000 in the value of United States Steel and General Motors?

## ASKS LONGER TRIAL FOR MARKET ACT

After your readers have perused the stock and commodity market report in this article they will see that, though mistakes may have been made in marketing, the farmer has fared as well or better in wheat operations as have those with many, many years of experience in dealing in his commodities or in manufacture or industry. But you must remember that higher commodity prices must lead the way out.

It took eight long years and countless proposals to the Members of Congress from every source to make a decision on what was really best for agriculture. After the entire matter of farm relief was hashed over by Congress, the agricultural marketing act we now have was passed and should be given a fair trial. The trial years of the Twin City Milk Producers' Association and also the Land O'Lakes would not be fair judgment on these two splendid cooperative agencies and why should this institution be condemned before it has had a fair trial in normal times? Its enemies certainly have picked ideal conditions under which to judge it if they wish to see it a failure, but the farmers should notice who these enemies are and judge their motives.

I have studied in recent weeks much of the mass of material that went before Congress before it made its decision to pass the agricultural marketing act. Many able men in the grain trade were called in to testify relative to a farm-relief program, and perhaps the ablest of them all, especially in the eyes of those who know him in Minneapolis, Mr. Fred B. Wells, appeared before the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives on April 4, 1929, and much of the material embodied in the marketing act is substantially the outgrowth of Mr. Wells's testimony.

## QUOTES WELLS ON HOPE OF FARMERS

Mr. Wells said in the course of his remarks:

"All of this may seem irrelevant and as having no bearing upon the subject which you have under consideration, but to me the experience in other lines of industry points the way to possible assistance for agriculture through legislation which will afford sympathetic leadership and will cultivate the appreciation of the fact that agriculture can hope to achieve success only through organization, cooperative action, and the utilization of information made available by Federal and State agricultural research work. I have said that I do not believe that legislation is the cure for the more serious agricultural troubles, but I am hopeful that sound legislation, designed to assist producers in their work of organization and in the financing of their initial cooperative efforts, would be of lasting benefit.

"Loans to cooperative commodity organizations: The Farm Board should be authorized upon the request of any cooperative commodity organization to make loans to such organization for the purpose of assisting in the financing of its merchandising operations, providing that the cooperative meets the requirements of the board in its form of organization, its financial condition, its methods of accounting, the character of its management, and that the board is satisfied that all other available credit facilities have been exhausted before application has been made to the board for a loan.

"Loans to cooperatives for the purchase, construction, or leasing of marketing facilities should only be authorized by the board

if, after a careful survey, it develops that the service required can not be secured through existing facilities at a reasonable charge. No loans for the construction of marketing facilities should be authorized if existing facilities suitable for the required purpose are available for purchase. It should be noted that the duplication of marketing facilities inevitably leads to an increased toll exacted from producers, as a natural result of the decreased volume handled by each operating unit.

"Stabilization corporations: Upon application of a commodity cooperative marketing association or of a group of cooperatives engaged in handling the same commodity the board may grant authority for the creation of a commodity stabilization corporation if, upon investigation, the board is convinced that an emergency exists, or is imminent, in respect to the commodity involved, and that the operations of the corporation can be reasonably expected to prevent undue price depression and safeguard the producers against unusual losses.

"In granting the authorization for the creation of a commodity stabilization corporation, the board shall stipulate the form of organization to be adopted, the methods of accounting to be employed, and the amount of capital to be subscribed by cooperative stockholders, and the character of management of such corporations must be acceptable to the board.

## COOPERATION OFFERED BY GRAIN TRADE

"The board should be empowered to make loans to authorized commodity stabilization corporations for the purpose of assisting in the financing of their merchandising operations, but no loans should be made by the board until other credit facilities have been exhausted, and all such loans should be secured by a lien upon the commodity involved."

"In conclusion, I would again state that while I do not believe that legislation can or will cure all agricultural ills, I feel confident that if the producers will assume their share of the responsibility and if they are given the assistance of a sympathetic Farm Board of outstanding ability, the condition of agriculture can be greatly improved through the passage of legislation of the general character which I have suggested, and I can assure you that, as far as is consistent, the grain trade and the leading markets of the country will cooperate with the Farm Board and other agencies to the end that this worth-while experiment may receive a fair trial."

(The farmers of this country are watching with much interest the cooperation from the grain trade.)

"In my statement I have expressed my personal views on proposed legislation, but I am authorized to advise you that in a general way the grain markets enumerated concur in my recommendations: Chicago, New York, St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Duluth, and Omaha."

"Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Wells, if such a bill as you have outlined should be enacted and put into operation, and it was successful, would not this board you have described in a few years be doing the business which you and your associates are doing now?"

"Mr. WELLS. Eventually that would be my expectation and my hope."

"Mr. ASWELL. How much salary would you pay the members of the board?"

"Mr. WELLS. I have not given that matter a thought."

"Mr. ASWELL. But you are a business man, and we want to have your opinion as a successful business man. You represent the very position you have been describing. What would you pay the members of the board?"

"Mr. WELLS. If you were going to run a private business, and the question of a desire for public service was eliminated, you would have to pay the members of such a board \$50,000 a year, and the chairman probably \$75,000.

"Mr. ASWELL. Leave out the 'ifs.' How much would you pay them?"

"Mr. WELLS. I think men might be found for possibly \$15,000 a year, \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year, who would be anxious to be of public service. The chairman would have to be paid more, undoubtedly."

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the cooperatives be inclined to organize stabilization corporations in emergency cases if the total loss was to be assumed by them?"

"Mr. WELLS. The total loss would not be assumed by them, as I had it in mind. The cooperative members of a stabilization corporation, as organizations holding the stock, could only lose their stock, the amount which they had subscribed to the capital stock of the stabilization corporation, and any losses incurred beyond that would fall upon the Treasury.

## WELLS PREDICTED LOSSES BY BOARD

"Mr. WILLIAMS. The Treasury of the United States, out of this fund?"

"Mr. WELLS. Yes; and be reimbursed later on by any profits the corporations might make."

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is, perhaps, the idea that the majority of the committee have, that the security required for the stabilization corporations might be a little thin at times."

"Mr. WELLS. It undoubtedly would be thin, from a commercial standpoint."

"Mr. WILLIAMS. From a commercial standpoint, and this being an experiment, a new trail we are blazing, that the Government rather than the organized farmers should assume the major risk in the stabilization corporations."

"Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Wells, you think, I imagine, that if the American farmer is to get an American price—that is, the world price plus the tariff—by reason of this legislation, that there is



going to be a loss in the transactions of this stabilize corporation; is that not true?

"Mr. WELLS. I do not think that as a result of this legislation you can guarantee the American farmer the world price plus the tariff.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. I say, if he does get that, which is the hope of this legislation, then you think there will be losses in the transactions of this stabilization corporation, do you not?

"Mr. WELLS. If that is the purpose of the stabilization corporation, in the majority of cases the operations will be conducted at a loss, and a substantial loss.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. And, of course, that loss would come out of the Treasury?

"Mr. WELLS. Yes; it would come out of the Treasury, except that any profit realized would go to offset the loss.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. Would you have a stabilization corporation for each commodity?

"Mr. WELLS. Inevitably you must have.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. And the stock of it would be farmer owned and farmer controlled.

"Mr. WELLS. Oh, yes; absolutely.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. You think this is a constructive proposition?

"Mr. WELLS. I think it is affording the American farmer an opportunity never afforded to any group of our citizens.

"Mr. KINCHELOE. I do, too. Do you think this is sound?

"Mr. WELLS. I think this is perfectly sound.

"Mr. JONES. Pursuing the questions asked by Mr. Purnell, in reference to your statement that the loan should not be made until existing credit facilities had been exhausted, I agree that there should not be any loans made except on a sound basis. And yet it seems to me that one of the important reasons for these loans is to enable them to get the money at a lower rate of interest than many of them have been able to get it for. If the board could make a sound loan at 4 per cent and existing credit facilities would not enable them to get it for less than 6 or 8 per cent, would you still make the proposition?

#### DECLARED ONLY HELP THROUGH COOPERATIVES

"Mr. WELLS. I believe that the creation of a suitable farm board will do more toward improving the morale of the producers of this country than anything that could be done. The shipper has been able to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the business man who thinks he is subjected to unfair competition can go to the Federal Trade Commission, and other agencies have been set up which have been of assistance to the business and commercial interests of the country. You might say that the Department of Agriculture is working for the benefit of the farmer or could work for the benefit of the farmer. It can, of course, but is largely on the production side.

"When it comes to marketing, their organization can explain the theory, but so far as practical operations are concerned, they are not in a position to assist the farmer. I think that the moment the farmers of the country realize that they have a board composed of men who are sympathetically inclined toward them, to whom they can present their problems and state their views as to what can be done, from whom they can receive advice and financial assistance, I believe it will help the cooperative organization movement through this country tremendously.

"Mr. KETCHAM. And in that you believe we will find the key to the situation?

"Mr. WELLS. Yes. I think that it is only through the cooperatives that we can balance agricultural production with the market requirements. \* \* \*

"Mr. FULMER. Mr. Wells, I believe I understood you to say in your opening remarks that it was your belief that it would be hard for Congress to pass any legislation that would help make the agricultural interests prosperous in this country; or, in other words, that it would depend largely upon the agricultural interests organizing and using better methods, employing improved machinery, and so forth.

"Mr. WELLS. Yes, sir; and I think I said that by affording sympathetic leadership and impressing upon the agricultural interests the fact that they can only achieve success through cooperative organization and the utilization of information which has been made available by the research departments of the Government and of the States, they could be assisted. I said that was the only hope for success."

Mr. Wells was evidently the spokesman for organized industry when he advocated this plan, for the Business Men's Commission in its report of 1927 and the United States Chamber of Commerce in its 1928 report advocated the same general plan. While this plan is the result of the efforts of organized agriculture, it was not dictated by agriculture. There is enough of merit in the plan so that agriculture has almost unanimously supported it and have made a sincere effort to make it successful. In fact, it has succeeded to such an extent that the grain trade and their associates now fear that it will be made a permanent success and that it will take out of their hands and put into the hands of the farmers themselves the privilege of handling their own products, thus avoiding the speculation and the waste to which farm products have been subject for generations past. However, it comes with very poor grace at this time for the representatives of the grain trade and other speculators in agricultural products to train their guns on the very things they advocated three years ago.

W. F. SCHILLING,  
Member Federal Farm Board.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the committee amendment was amended by an amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Therefore I think the only thing to do is to have a reconsideration of the vote by which that amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate reconsider the vote whereby the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first question would be on reconsidering the vote whereby the committee amendment as amended was adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I share the expression of the Senator from Pennsylvania in regard to the unfairness to the Senator from South Carolina of reviewing this matter now. He was very much in earnest about it; he is not here now, the Senate acted, and he had accomplished what he set out to accomplish on the expressed view of Senators; and now, while he is away, an effort is made to take up the whole subject and review it again. I do not think that is quite fair to him. I do not like to delay, but it seems to me that if there were some way of avoiding that and getting something in conference about it, I would not object to it.

I might say further, in reference to the Federal Farm Board—

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves the point he has just been discussing?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. NYE. If I felt that the Senator from South Carolina on Saturday did not appreciate that we were going to have a test on this question of reconsideration I certainly would not move for it to-day, but he knew on Saturday that an attempt would be made to have the vote reconsidered, and I am sure the Senator from South Carolina would be the last one to criticize anyone in the Senate for doing what we are trying to accomplish here at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know the Senator from North Dakota would not take advantage of any Senator on any question. I appreciate his situation and his understanding in the matter. I simply want to make the point, however.

When it comes to the question of the Federal Farm Board I voted to establish the board, and I had in mind that it was not intended simply to create an organization here to stabilize agriculture solely. One of the objects was to help to stabilize prices of agricultural products, but one of the chief things, it seemed to me, was to create an organization here which would devise and establish a system of marketing agricultural products, devise and establish an economical system for the proper distribution of the products of agriculture. That was the thing I thought we were attempting to accomplish.

Some years ago we had difficulty about financing agriculture. The farmers could not get accommodations as business people could. Banks would not lend on farm products. Then we thought the need of the agricultural interests of the country would be met by a system whereby they could be accommodated on their own terms financially. Therefore, we created the Farm Loan Board, passed the farm loan act, and established that system, which has been of great help to agriculture. Two billion dollars have been made available to the farmers of the country at 5½ per cent interest, payable 1 per cent annually on the principal, practically on their own terms. That has been of great value to agriculture.

We have gradually extended and expanded the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of helping the agricultural interests of the country, and I have supported every one of the measures and every one of those steps, because I look upon agriculture as the foundation of all our strength and prosperity. I think it is our duty to see if we can establish a healthy agriculture in this country.

After we did that, the farmers obtained financial accommodations on those terms. The Department of Agriculture was very active and rendered immense service to the farmers



throughout the country. We found that the products of agriculture were yielding no return to the farmers. The farmers could produce and did produce, the yield was tremendous; there was an overproduction, it was claimed.

It was not a question of overproduction, in my judgment; it was a question of underconsumption. The lack of purchasing power has caused the terrible decline and languishing condition of agriculture. So we found we needed another thing—we needed to devise some plan whereby the farmers of the country could get their products to market and realize something from them. They were producing abundantly the finest kind of products, needed by the people, furnishing the food of the Nation, but they were not getting the cost of production out of it. Transportation has something to do with it. I think the rates have always been too high on agricultural products. Among other things, marketing conditions did not avail. There was not a proper system, or any system at all, scarcely. Farmers would ship their products to market and get practically nothing for them. So what we did was to establish an organization here that would devise and establish a system of economical distribution, proper distribution, of agricultural products, not necessarily raising the prices to the consumers at all, but a plan whereby the producer would get a larger share of the proceeds from his products than he has been getting.

That was my purpose, but I fail to see that there has been devised any system of marketing. They have established cooperative organizations and it may be that is their theory upon which the whole thing must be worked out. Certainly the cooperative organizations have not been helping the producer so far as I can see. That is not the final thing to be accomplished by this great board. It was to establish a proper system of marketing of agricultural products. I do not know whether the appropriation will help to do anything in that direction or not. I am willing to vote for any appropriation that will bring about that object and thereby help the producer. He is the man in whom I am interested.

The consumers are not paying too much, and we do not ask that they pay more than they are paying, but we do ask that the producer shall receive a larger share of the proceeds from his product than he is now receiving. That, I think, could be accomplished if there was a proper system for the distribution of agricultural products and proper marketing arrangements established. I am willing to vote for the appropriation if they are working out something along that line. I can not see that they have accomplished very much in that direction up to this time.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I agree with much that the Senator from Florida has said. One thing the Farm Board was to do was to work out cooperative organizations. They have made great progress along that line. It is true the cooperatives have not brought about the advantage to the producer that had been hoped for, but under existing conditions there has been no progress in any line of business. I can not think of a single line of business in which there has been any progress or any profit in the last two or three years. Agriculture, of course, has been hit harder than any other business interest because of the general conditions. But it is not the fault of the Farm Board. Perhaps they have made mistakes; I believe they have.

In the first place, the marketing act was not what the farmers themselves wanted, and it was not what their organizations had advocated, but it was a proposal that was forced upon them by Congress. The members of the Farm Board were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Several members of the Farm Board were not those whom the farmers or their organizations wanted, but they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. While some of them have done the best they could and the best they knew how, some others knew mighty little of the marketing problems of the farmer. They may have learned something. I hold no brief for them. At the same time I think it is unfair to cut off their appropriation at this time.

At the beginning of the session a resolution was introduced providing for an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; they were directed to investigate the

activities of the Farm Board. Since that resolution was adopted the cooperatives have been organized under the Farm Board and have been here persistently requesting and demanding that the investigation be held. It has not been held because of the other duties of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the other members of the committee. The chairman has promised that just as soon as the session adjourns the investigation will be started.

I think it is absolutely unfair to cut off the appropriation for the board at this time. Give them a chance. No one here who is fair will make the statement that the Farm Board is responsible for the prices of farm products at the present time. The prices of farm products during the past year have been higher than the world prices practically all the time for the same products, and in my opinion the Farm Board should have some credit for keeping the products even as high as they are, although they are lower than they have ever been before. The prices of our wheat, for instance, have been higher consistently at Minneapolis than for like grain in Winnipeg, just across the line.

Members of the Farm Board may be criticized. Perhaps when the investigation is held it will be found that a lot of mistakes have been made. I am anxious to see the investigation begun and carried on, but until it is made I think it is absolutely unfair to cut off the appropriation at this time. I am satisfied that some of the things that have been forced upon them have not been their fault, but the fault of those higher up who appointed them and were responsible for the farm marketing act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I want to make a brief statement for the RECORD. It was stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and now it has been repeated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] that the Farm Board bill was framed by Congress. I do not think that is historically accurate. The bill was written by the President of the United States and it was jammed through the Congress because all of the farm organizations and the Senators who have worked upon farm-relief problems became convinced that it was the only measure that would receive the approval of the President of the United States. So far as I was concerned I did not approve of abandoning the fight that had been made here through several sessions of Congress for the principle involved in those measures for farm relief. I think I was one of eight Senators who voted against the agricultural marketing act.

I did not want the statement to go unchallenged in the RECORD that this bill was a responsibility solely of Congress. It was Herbert Hoover's answer to the pledge he made in the 1928 campaign that he would put agriculture back on an equal footing with other industries in the country.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is correct in placing the real responsibility for the Farm Board bill. Nevertheless Congress has some responsibility for yielding to that influence and that suggestion.

The farm marketing act for one thing gave the Farm Board the job of organizing cooperatives for marketing purposes and also gave to the board the job of handling indirectly the exportable surplus of agriculture. The exportable surplus of agriculture for many years in ordinary times amounted to some \$1,800,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 a year. Congress gave them \$500,000,000 to handle that job.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] now comes here criticizing the business methods of the board. When we came to creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help out the railroads and the banks and the insurance companies—and that is about all that was included in it in the beginning—we gave them \$2,000,000,000 more money than all the others combined.

The Farm Board started out with the very elements of failure in it to begin with. Its financing machinery was wholly inadequate. The two are just alike in principle so far as that is concerned. The Farm Board does not buy farm products at all. It makes loans to stabilization corporations and cooperatives for the purpose of buying the products to stabilize and for the purpose of marketing them



through the cooperatives. In the same way the Reconstruction Finance Corporation makes loans. It does not go out and do the business directly. They are both Bolshevik measures so far as that is concerned, putting the Government into the money-lending business, into the banking business as it were. But in the one case, as soon as it was found the Reconstruction Finance Corporation did not have enough funds to relieve the depression, as soon as it was found that \$2,000,000,000 was only a drop in the bucket, we came right in at once and passed another bill through the Senate and the House providing \$1,500,000,000 more to go into that corporation, and that bill is now in conference and is being considered by us at this moment.

Here is agriculture with only \$500,000,000 to handle a surplus that amounts to \$2,000,000,000—not that much at present low prices—and to organize the cooperative marketing system in addition to that, and they are given the pusillanimous sum of \$500,000,000 to do the whole job. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] knows, and every man who has considered a proposition like this knew from the beginning, that it could not succeed. I voted for that bill only in the hope that when it was apparent it would not succeed, they would come to Congress, as has been done in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and ask for enough more so as to succeed and so they could properly perform the functions given to them by the act. But nobody comes here with that proposition. Instead of that we talk about cutting off the appropriation altogether and abolishing the board.

I do not approve of abolishing the board itself. I think first they ought to come back and point out the deficiency in the funds we provided and demand that we increase their appropriation to the proper amount. I think they have wholly failed in their duty in that regard. I think in buying the surplus that they did buy or loan the money to buy they bought it like a set of gamblers. They did not buy all of it. They did not pursue any such policy as that, and of course they had to take a gambler's chance. Besides that, I think they held the surplus as a menace over the world market all the time, and in that regard I do not quite agree with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I think, however, they held the surplus as a menace over the world market and broke down or helped to break down the world market itself. Probably they did the world market more damage than they did good to the domestic market.

In 1929 it was the other way. They did not operate on the domestic market. Wheat was 15 to 20 cents better than the world price throughout the entire harvesting period of 1929, but some time in 1930 and again in 1931 they claimed to have raised it 15 cents above the world market, but they always neglected to show what they did to the world market itself by holding this surplus as a menace over the world market.

During the consideration of this legislation and since its enactment there has never been a time when I have not pointed out to the Senate that the funds were inadequate and that we had not granted enough funds and enough authority to properly finance and handle this surplus. As I have said so many times, it was the President of the United States himself who pointed out this policy to the Congress in handling the Wheat Corporation and the Food Administration during and after the war, the last time being on the 4th of March, 1919, when Congress passed a bill providing \$1,000,000,000 for wheat alone and further authorizing the Wheat Corporation to borrow more millions if it needed it to handle the exportable surplus of wheat at that time.

Instead of looking at this in a businesslike way and meeting the facts, we are here saying the Farm Board ought to be abolished. I agree that it ought to be abolished if we are going to continue this policy and if we will not give them funds enough and give them a policy which will enable them to work out something for the benefit of the farmers of the country.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, is the question upon the reconsideration of the committee amendment as amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the request for reconsideration has been granted and

the question now is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. NYE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator presented some very interesting figures for the Record reflecting the loans that had been made from the revolving fund. Will he give me again the total of the loans that have been made?

Mr. NYE. The total loans made by the Federal Farm Board were \$985,295,427.24 as of May 1, 1932.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator's table show the average rate of interest at which those loans were made?

Mr. NYE. No; I do not have that information, Mr. President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator think that it is probably correct that the rate of interest is well under 2 per cent?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if the conversation between my eminent friends is not meant to be kept entirely secret, may I ask to have the advantage of hearing the figures? They interest me to a very considerable degree.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am trying to disclose the figures so that they may not be confidential. I am trying to discover the average rate of interest at which the \$900,000,000 has been loaned to cooperatives and to stabilization corporations under the Farm Board act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it occurs to me that it is a matter of complete indifference whether we are going to get any interest. If we are going to lose the huge amount of the principal, it is not important what is the rate of interest.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The fact remains that I think it is exceedingly important as bearing upon the attitude of Congress in respect of the whole situation, and I persist in the wish to know if the information is available.

Mr. NYE. If I may make the suggestion, I think it would be very safe to conclude that the recovery by the Federal Farm Board of loans outstanding against the cooperatives will be as large as will be the recovery by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from those to whom it loans money.

Mr. BORAH. That corporation may never recover any.

Mr. NYE. It may recover very little, if any.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, apparently all questions in this Congress are to be settled by recriminations about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has the information which the Senator from Michigan was requesting, and I yield to him.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say there—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota yielded to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let me ask the Senator this question: If the Farm Board had \$500,000,000—and that is all they had—how could they loan \$980,000,000?

Mr. NYE. It is a revolving fund that is being loaned out and paid back and reloaned to other cooperatives or to the same cooperatives as advances are required from the revolving fund.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us how much is outstanding in loans at the present time?

Mr. NYE. Will round figures answer the Senator's question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. NYE. The outstanding cooperative loans are \$166,000,000 and the outstanding stabilization loans are \$303,000,000.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us the value at present prices of the commodities held by the stabilization corporations?

Mr. NYE. I can not; but I am sure any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who attended the hearings can give that information. Perhaps the Senator from Maine has the information.



Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have a statement here as of March 26 in respect to these loans and the rates of interest thereon. Before giving the figures, let me say that it is interesting to bear in mind that the language under which these loans were made was almost precisely the same as that contained in the merchant marine act of 1923 with respect to loans for the building of American ships. However, in the marketing act there was added a provision placing a maximum upon the rate of interest—that no loan should call for a rate of interest in excess of 4 per cent.

As of March 26 and at about that time or shortly thereafter these figures were given me: The highest rate of interest on any loan was 3½ per cent; the lowest rate was one-eighth of 1 per cent; and the average rate of interest was 1.7 per cent. I can not go into any greater detail than that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota whether his proposed amendment has any reference to loans to cooperatives?

Mr. NYE. None whatever.

Mr. BLAINE. The proposal is merely to appropriate money for the operating expenses of the Federal Farm Board?

Mr. NYE. Yes, Mr. President; I am at a loss to understand just how my motion can be pending before the Senate, because I have not made the motion I intend to make after reconsideration is granted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair will say that he obtained that information from the Vice President.

Mr. NYE. If the Chair holds that the Senate has given consent to reconsideration, I now move that the committee amendment as amended by the Senate be amended by striking out the figures "\$600,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Has consent for reconsideration been given?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the present occupant of the chair took the chair, he was informed by the Vice President that consent for reconsideration had been granted, and that the Senator from North Dakota had entered the motion, which was the pending question.

Mr. REED. I understood the Senator from North Dakota moved to reconsider; on that we asked for the yeas and nays, and then debate was resumed. That motion was never disposed of. It is a matter of indifference, however, for we will reach the same result by voting on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. I am sure we will reach the same result in either event. Would the Senator like to have the Record cleared now?

Mr. REED. I will not insist on it. We may just as well settle it by voting on the Senator's motion to amend.

Mr. NYE. Very well. Then the amendment which I have proposed would make the provision read as follows:

All unexpended balances of appropriations for the Federal Farm Board are hereby made available for the purposes enumerated in this paragraph, not exceeding \$1,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay a vote upon the amendment. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made inquiry respecting the rates of interest which have been charged cooperatives on loans from the Federal Farm Board. The Senator from Maine gave information as of March, 1932. I just sent to my office for a letter from the Federal Farm Board dated June 20, 1932, and have obtained it. In that letter Mr. Stone, chairman of the Federal Farm Board, states that five loans since January, 1930, aggregating \$584,629, have been made to cooperatives on which the interest rates range from 1½ to 3½ per cent, or an average of 2.281 per cent.

Also, referring to three other loans, he says interest rates vary from one-half of 1 per cent to 2½ per cent, or an average of 1.208 per cent, on those loans. So the interest rates vary materially from one-half of 1 per cent to 3½ per cent, and on some classes of loans the average is 2.23 per cent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the amendment to the amendment may be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

All unexpended balances of appropriations for the Federal Farm Board are hereby made available for the purposes enumerated in this paragraph, not exceeding \$1,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AUSTIN (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. If he were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CAREY (when his name was called). On this question, I have a pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], who is absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I do not know how he would vote, and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I do not know how he would vote, and so I will have to withhold my vote.

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. NYE (when his name was called). Upon this question I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. COHEN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I am not advised as to how he would vote. I therefore must withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STEIWER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]



to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HATFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. Not being able to secure a transfer, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am informed that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (after having voted in the affirmative). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I have voted, so I will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DICKINSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DALE. On this matter I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES. I am advised that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], if present, would vote as I shall vote, so I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] with the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]; and

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 12, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—12

Brookhart	Frazier	McNary	Robinson, Ind.
Capper	Hayden	Norbeck	Schall
Fletcher	Johnson	Oddie	Sheppard

#### NAYS—33

Ashurst	George	Metcalf	Trammell
Barbour	Hale	Moses	Vandenberg
Bingham	Hebert	Norris	Wagner
Blaine	Jones	Pittman	Walcott
Borah	Kean	Reed	Watson
Bratton	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	White
Bulow	Keyes	Smoot	
Copeland	La Follette	Stephens	
Couzens	McGill	Thomas, Okla.	

#### NOT VOTING—51

Austin	Costigan	Hatfield	Shipstead
Bailey	Cutting	Hawes	Shortridge
Bankhead	Dale	Howell	Smith
Barkley	Davis	Hull	Steiner
Black	Dickinson	King	Swanson
Broussard	Dill	Lewis	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkley	Fess	Logan	Townsend
Byrnes	Glass	Long	Tydings
Caraway	Glenn	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Goldsborough	Morrison	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Gore	Neely	Waterman
Connally	Harrison	Nye	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hastings	Patterson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 12 and the nays are 33. Inasmuch as a quorum has not

voted, the Chair desires to have noted in the Journal the fact that Senators AUSTIN, CAREY, HOWELL, NYE, SHIPSTEAD, SHORTRIDGE, STEINER, THOMAS of Idaho, TOWNSEND, HATFIELD, HASTINGS, DICKINSON, and DALE are present in the Chamber and paired, thus constituting a quorum present. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] to the amendment of the committee is therefore rejected.

The question now recurs upon the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Utah. On page 22, line 4, after the word "available," I propose to strike out the period and insert:

For the payment of salaries and expenses in the fiscal year 1932.

This provision of \$60,000 was made immediately available for the purpose of paying salaries and expenses during the present fiscal year. I think there can be no objection to the amendment, and will content myself with the very brief explanation already made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the entry of the motion which I filed to reconsider the vote whereby the amendments on page 14 were agreed to; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Mr. J. C. Wright, Director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, both orders will be entered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,  
Washington, June 25, 1932.

HON. R. M. LA FOLLETTE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to a telephone request from your office received to-day I am submitting herewith a statement showing reductions in the appropriations to the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 10022, and the economy bill, H. R. 11267, for the fiscal year 1933.

Very truly yours,

J. C. WRIGHT, Director.

REDUCTIONS UNDER H. R. 10022, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EXECUTIVE OFFICES, INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS, ETC. (PP. 13-17)

Item 1: The appropriation of \$30,000 authorized for the Territory of Hawaii is not reduced in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Item 2: The act known as the George-Reed Act, providing additional funds for agriculture and home economics, approved February 5, 1929, authorized \$2,000,000 for allotment to the States for the fiscal year 1933. The Bureau of the Budget reduced this amount to \$1,500,000 in the President's estimates submitted to Congress, and this estimate was not further reduced in the House or Senate.

Item 3: Under the George-Reed Act Congress provided \$100,000 to the Federal Board for Vocational Education for administrative purposes. The Budget submitted \$93,805, which was reduced by the Senate Appropriation Committee to \$85,000, a reduction of \$8,805.

Item 4: Under the act of June 2, 1920, as amended, Congress provided \$1,097,000 for cooperative vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry, this amount being allotted to the States. No reduction in this item was made.

Item 5: Under the foregoing act Congress authorized to the Federal board \$80,000 for administrative expenses. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$77,860 and the Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced this amount to \$65,000.

Under the cooperative vocational rehabilitation act for the District of Columbia Congress authorized \$15,000 to the Federal board. This item was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to \$14,740 and was further reduced by the Senate Appropriations Committee to \$12,000, a reduction of \$2,740.

Item 6: Under the act extending the benefits of vocational education to Puerto Rico, approved March 3, 1931, Congress authorized \$105,000. This amount was reduced by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to \$75,000, a reduction of \$30,000.

REDUCTIONS UNDER H. R. 11267, OR THE SO-CALLED ECONOMY BILL (PP. 78-80, JUNE 9, 1932—PRINTING)

In this bill Congress has provided for the following additional reductions not covered in the independent-offices appropriation bill:

Item 1: On page 79, under paragraph (b), a graduated flat 10 per cent reduction in appropriations to be allotted to the States



for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes Act, approved February 23, 1917, of \$716,700.

Item 2: The economy bill in paragraph (d), on page 80, makes a reduction in the appropriation to the Territory of Hawaii of \$3,000.

## SUMMARY

The foregoing reductions when compared with the amounts authorized to be appropriated or appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, represent a total reduction of 11.8 per cent for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation in the 48 States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the island of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, on Saturday I gave notice that on to-day, at the first opportunity, I should make a motion to have the Committee on the District of Columbia discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4781, authorizing an emergency appropriation for the relief of needy and distressed residents of the District of Columbia and for the temporary care of transient and homeless persons in said District. On Saturday I debated this matter briefly. I did not care to interrupt the consideration of the appropriation bill, but I understand that we are about to recess or adjourn. I therefore desire to renew, first, my request for unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4781.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will not the Senator wait until we pass the appropriation bill and then ask recognition?

Mr. BLAINE. I fear that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] may make a motion to recess or adjourn when that is done.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no intention at the present moment to do what is suggested; but I should have to object to the request at this time because of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I suggest that the Senator bide his time. I have sent for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]; and meanwhile we can probably pass this bill.

Mr. BLAINE. The statement of the Senator is satisfactory to me.

## PASSAGE OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

## LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, earlier in the day I entered a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the legislative bill was sent back to conference. Pursuant to that, I now ask that the House be requested to return the papers to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BINGHAM. What is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington moves that the House be requested to return the papers in the matter of the legislative appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. BINGHAM. What is the object of the motion?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. The motion is not debatable. The object, of course, is to give the Senate a chance to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for two minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. I object, Mr. President, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The motion is not debatable under the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut moves to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington. That motion also is not debatable. [Putting the question:] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call for a division.

Mr. BRATTON and Mr. JOHNSON called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I know this motion is not debatable, but I do think the Senate ought to have two minutes to understand it. We do not know what it is about. Will not the Senate give some one, I do not care whom—certainly not myself—two minutes to say what it is all about?

Mr. BINGHAM. I withdraw the motion to lay the motion of the Senator from Washington on the table, in the hope that the motion may be explained.

Mr. ASHURST. Two minutes!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is requested for the Senator from Washington to explain the purpose of his motion. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall object to the Senator from Washington having an opportunity to explain his motion unless my own request be granted also.

Mr. WATSON. I ask unanimous consent that each of the Senators shall have three minutes to explain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COUZENS. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Washington. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded? The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ASHURST voted "yea."

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order, the Senator from Arizona having voted.

Mr. BROOKHART. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROOKHART. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the motion proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the House be requested to return to the Senate the papers in the case of the legislative appropriation bill. The clerk will continue the calling of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DICKINSON (when his name was called). On this question I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOWELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], as I did before. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I expect to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present, he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr.



TYDINGS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. Were I permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. COHEN]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STEIWER (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair as on the last vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague is detained by official business. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] with the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

I also desire to announce the general pair of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. DICKINSON. I am informed that if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] were present he would vote as I intend to vote, and therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], but I understand that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who, I understand, if present would vote as I have voted. Therefore I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], who is paired with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who is also absent. If the junior Senator from New Mexico were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. When I voted I believed that he would vote as I intended to vote. As some very strange announcements have been made, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Making the same announcement of my pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], not being advised as to how he would vote, I must decline to vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. NYE. I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore must withhold my vote.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I bespeak you for some parliamentary information. I was out of the Chamber, and I want to cast a vote that would be in favor of the married women to have a right to earn their living as well as the men. How should I vote?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to answer.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, if the Chair can not answer me as to the married women, I would like to know if he can give me an expert opinion as to one who is not. [Laughter.] I vote "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce the following special pair on this question:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN].

I desire also to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

I also wish to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE].

The roll call resulted—yeas 29, nays 18—as follows:

#### YEAS—29

Ashurst	Couzens	Jones	Stephens
Austin	Dickinson	Kean	Trammell
Barbour	Fletcher	Keyes	Vandenberg
Black	George	McGill	Watson
Borah	Hale	McNary	White
Bratton	Hastings	Moses	
Bulow	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	
Capper	Hebert	Smoot	

#### NAYS—18

Blaine	Johnson	Norris	Sheppard
Brookhart	Kendrick	Oddie	Thomas, Okla.
Copeland	La Follette	Reed	Walcott
Dale	Lewis	Robinson, Ind.	
Frazier	Norbeck	Schall	

#### NOT VOTING—49

Bailey	Cutting	King	Steiwer
Bankhead	Davis	Logan	Swanson
Barkley	Dill	Long	Thomas, Idaho
Bingham	Fess	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Glass	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulkley	Glenn	Morrison	Wagner
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Gore	Nye	Walsh, Mont.
Carey	Harrison	Patterson	Waterman
Cohen	Hatfield	Pittman	Wheeler
Connally	Hawes	Shipstead	
Coolidge	Howell	Shortridge	
Costigan	Hull	Smith	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 27, the nays are 18. A quorum not having voted, the Chair directs that there be entered in the Journal the fact that Senators HATFIELD, HOWELL, METCALF, SHIPSTEAD, STEIWER, THOMAS of Idaho, BINGHAM, SHORTRIDGE, and NYE were present in the Chamber and paired, thus constituting a quorum. So the motion of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the House of Representatives be requested to return the papers connected with the legislative appropriation bill is agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senate has just indulged in a very curious procedure. It is true that under the rules no debate was permitted on the motion offered by the Senator from Washington. It was never intended under the rules that no explanation could be had. As I read the rules, the motion should have been made immediately upon the motion being offered by the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report on the economy bill was rejected and new conferees were requested.

During the debate on the economy bill it became apparent that there were three or four measures in the bill which did not meet the views of the Senate at all. In the first place, there was the provision that savings from the so-called furlough plan would not result in the employment of employees who would otherwise be discharged, but that the manner in which the comptroller would interpret the bill would lead to the employment of all employees who could be employed under the amount of any given appropriation as passed by the Senate, and that then those employees would have to take a furlough or be subject to an 8½ per cent cut.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in the debate at that time admitted that that was his object, namely, that many employees should be discharged, and that we should therefore save money by this provision. But the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], who was one of the



conferees, explained that that was not the object of the conference report at all; that it was his understanding of it that the full amount of the appropriation might be used, and if, due to the action of the furlough plan, the money could be spread over a larger number of employees than otherwise, it might be possible that no employees would be discharged. At any rate, there was a clear misunderstanding on the part of the two distinguished Members across the aisle as to the meaning of it, and the hope that it might be cleared up by the conferees was one of the reasons why we disagreed to the conference report.

Another reason was that many of us believed that the section requiring the discharge or compulsory furloughing for a long period of time of persons living with husband or wife, both husband and wife being employed by the Government, was a cruel measure, working unnecessary hardships, and would not save one single dollar for the Treasury—was not, in truth, an economy measure at all, but was changing a Government policy—and that that ought to go back to conference.

Another question was the question of the forced retirement on the part of employees performing their duties satisfactorily. That measure was believed by the Senate Economy Committee to be not in the public interest, in that it did not save money. Others would have to be appointed in their places, and they would have to receive their retirement pay, and it might actually cost the Government more money, so it had no place in the bill.

Another question was the matter of the restricting of that part of their retirement pay which was due to Army and Navy officers who have served us faithfully for many years, the matter pointed out very clearly and explicitly by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

For these and other reasons the Senate voted at that time to send the bill back to conference at that time, having no difficulty in securing a quorum on any motion, there being no great excitement in Chicago as at present, which has not only decimated but fairly almost extinguished the distinguished representation on the other side, with the exception of some 10 distinguished gentlemen, who are doing their best to represent the minority party. At present some 25 or more of them are absent on very important business, and I for one regret that the Senate did not take a recess to give them and their colleagues an opportunity to attend the very interesting function going on in Chicago.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, at the suggestion of the chairman of the conference committee himself, who suggested that the Senate vote to send the matter back to conference by disagreeing to the conference report, without a record vote the conference report was rejected, and the matter automatically then went back to conference.

On the subsequent day the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] announced that he proposed to enter a motion to reconsider. As I read the debate, he did that with no thought that it might be immediately necessary to do it, but in the thought that if the House should refuse to appoint conferees and should hold up this matter for indefinite delay it might then be important that the Senate should be able to reconsider the vote whereby we had rejected the conference report. It was in a measure a technical motion that he was making to protect the Senate against any situation that might arise which might permit us to adjourn without having passed the proper economy measure. As such I thought he was well within his rights.

Now the Senator from Washington comes here and requests a return of the papers, thereby undoing all that we did. We turned down the conference report and sent it back to the House and asked for the appointment of new conferees. But, lo and behold, there are some Members of the House—some important Members of the House—who believe that their presence in Chicago is more necessary than their attention to their duties here in the Congress and the Speaker apparently being unwilling to appoint new conferees, no conferees are appointed and the matter is in abeyance; and lest the matter be delayed too long, this

motion of the Senator from Oregon is pending. But now the Senator from Washington, without any explanation, calls back the papers from the House, so that at present the House is not even requested to appoint new conferees. Conferees are not even requested to attempt to straighten out the matters to which we objected on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. DALE. The Senator says "without any explanation." Has the Senator read in the press the reason why this action has been taken?

Mr. BINGHAM. No. I am accustomed to taking my news of Congress, or at least of the Senate, from activities and statements on the floor of the Senate. I do not know the article to which the Senator refers, but I do know the Senator from Washington is unwilling to give the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity for two minutes to discuss the matter.

Mr. DALE. That I may remain wholly within the rules, I can not speak in detail as I would like to do and state the reason, but the reason has been given by the press and the reason has been stated to Members of the Senate and the threat has been made, and the man who made it sat on the floor of the Senate until we took the vote and then went back to the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator is speaking in riddles so far as I am concerned. We spent three weeks day and night in trying to work out an economy bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has referred to the motion or the proposed motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was not agreed to. The Senator from Connecticut, of course, understands that the rule requires that before such a motion shall be considered the papers must be recalled, in the event they have passed out of the possession of the Senate. I take it that was the object of the Senator from Washington in making the motion that he did make, namely, to request the House to return the papers in order to give jurisdiction to the Senate to vote on the motion to reconsider. There is nothing extraordinary about it at all. It has been done many times. Of course, we could not with propriety discuss the question of reconsideration until the papers were returned.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. REED. I would like to suggest to the Senator that when the time comes to consider the motion to reconsider the vote by which we rejected the conference report, that motion is debatable, and I have not the slightest doubt that it will be debated very fully. The Senate will then have a chance to reaffirm its action rejecting the conference report and it will then be confronted with an opportunity to say whether it is going to be backed down by the action of the House in refusing to meet us in conference.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator. Probably the cause of my disquietude was due to the statement made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] in the debate that his notice of the motion to reconsider was merely to put the Senate in a technical position where it could once more consider the question in case the House delayed unduly. If that remark of his was not well founded—and it would seem that it was not well founded, because, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Arkansas, as soon as the motion to reconsider is entered the next motion that properly can be made is for a return of the papers—it would seem that we have been put in a very unfortunate position. We sent the papers



back and asked for a conference in order to see if some of these matters could not be straightened out.

Only one day has passed and now we are informed that we must ask for the papers in order that the motion to reconsider may be disposed of. There is no evidence that the House has been unwilling to appoint new conferees to consider the matter and see whether it could not meet us half way.

I hope the motion to reconsider under these circumstances will be defeated; but if it is defeated, we are faced with a very serious situation. I had hoped that the matter might go to conference again and that we might reach some middle ground between the extreme position taken by the House and the position desired by the Senate when we rejected the conference report. I wish our expert parliamentarian might find some way out of the dilemma in which we now find ourselves. The papers having come back, there is nothing to do but vote up or down the motion to reconsider. If we vote that down, then we are faced with a situation where we may not get any economy bill at all.

Mr. BINGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, so that the remarks between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] and myself may be understood by the patient and industrious readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask that there may be inserted at the conclusion of that colloquy the article in the Evening Star, to which the Senator from Vermont referred, which explains why the motion was made, and explains the statement of the Speaker of the House that he is not going to appoint new conferees and will name the same ones "if we stay here until August."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE TO RENAME CONFEREES IN ROW ON ECONOMY BILL—GARNER DECLARES HE WILL NOT CHANGE STAND "IF WE STAY HERE UNTIL AUGUST"—MCNARY ACTS TO BAR FINAL DEATH OF PROGRAM—SENATE RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE WOULD LEAVE DOOR OPEN TO ACCEPT PREVIOUS REPORT

The much-contested national economy bill to-day seemed headed for additional conflict before becoming law.

The Senate sent the \$150,000,000 measure back to conference Friday. To-day Speaker GARNER said he would reappoint the same House conferees, two of whom are in Chicago.

Chairman McDUFFIE, of the House group, will not return until Wednesday night. DOUGLAS of Arizona is expected back about the same time.

This would delay another meeting until Thursday, last day of the fiscal year.

#### WILL STICK TO DEMANDS

"I'm not going to appoint new conferees," GARNER said. "I'll name the same ones if we stay here until August."

The House, in session for the first time since Thursday, was formally notified to-day of the Senate's unexpected action. McDUFFIE is chairman of the House conferees and the success of the new conference is largely dependent on his willingness to acquiesce in the demands of the Senate. Before leaving Washington, McDUFFIE served notice that the House would refuse to yield and declared a deadlock would be inevitable.

In anticipation of such an eventuality, Senator McNARY, of Oregon, assistant Republican leader of the Senate, has taken a parliamentary step, however, to prevent the death of the bill in conference and salvage at least some of the \$150,000,000 savings it is estimated to produce. McNARY plans to offer a motion in the Senate some time to-day to have the Senate reconsider the viva voce vote by which it returned the bill to conference.

#### MAY RECALL MEASURE

The move is designed solely to give the Senate jurisdiction over the bill so it can recall the measure and accept the conference report should a deadlock develop in conference. McNARY feels the Senate will accept the report, despite the injustice the bill might work on the Government employees, rather than have it fail.

Throughout the debate on the bill belief was expressed by some Senators that the injustices might be worked out in administration, although they would rather have them removed before enactment, if that can be done without jeopardizing passage of the measure before adjournment of Congress.

One thing is certain—Congress does not propose to let its pet economy bill go to an untimely death.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives and invites the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. JONES. Just a moment, Mr. President. I have something to say before that is done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Although it is a privileged matter at any time, the Chair withdraws the message and the Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I feel that I should say a word in reply to the Senator from Connecticut. It is true, as all Senators know, that this matter was sent to the House asking for a conference. It was done in rather an informal way. I had hoped that the next day we would get the conference and adjust our differences, if possible. It is true that there are some Members of the House in Chicago who would act as conferees. They will not be back here for several days, in all probability. The House has not provided for any new conferees. We are confronted with a situation which is not a theory.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator understand that the House will not provide for new conferees?

Mr. JONES. I understand so. I understand the House will not provide for new conferees. What is the situation that confronts the Senate? We must have our appropriation bills passed by Thursday evening or else the financial and business affairs of the Government will be in chaos. That is the situation which confronts us. We have a provision in the economy bill that applies to all appropriation bills. If we are not going to pass the economy bill, then we must recall the appropriation bills upon which we have acted and incorporate a provision in each one of them with reference to employees, and all that sort of thing. In other words, the situation which confronts us now is that unless we get the economy bill through in ample time to let the appropriation bills go through by Thursday night, then the business of the United States Government will be in a chaotic condition. If Senators want to do that, if Senators want that condition to come about, I have no complaint, but I feel that I am discharging my responsibility in bringing the situation to the attention of the Senate.

Of course, I expected this discussion to come up to-morrow when the proposal comes before the Senate as to whether or not the Senate will reconsider the vote by which we rejected the conference report. If the Senate rejects the conference report, as it has a right to do, then, of course, we will do the best we can. I expect the discussion that will take place to-morrow to bring the situation squarely before the Senate. Then, of course, we shall be in a position where every Senator can discharge his responsibility.

The Senator from Connecticut points out two or three matters that are at issue. That is all true enough. Take the proposition with reference to the impounding of money that he presses upon the Senate. I want to call the Senator's attention to this fact. That situation is like this: Suppose there are 12 employees getting \$1,200 a year. Under the economy bill as we have prepared it now there would be \$1,200 that would be saved on account of the furlough. Shall we take that \$1,200 and put it into the Treasury or shall we take it to hire somebody else? I take it that these are not times when we are taking on new employees. That is the situation in relation to that matter.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. In just a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON. I simply want to ask a very brief question. If all these things are so, why did the Senator from Washington stand on the floor of the Senate and suggest the rejection of the conference report?

Mr. JONES. Because of the confusion and the misapprehension of Senators when they would not listen to any argument with reference to the actual situation confronting the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON. Senators argued all day upon the proposition and it was after all that argument that the Senator from Washington made his suggestion.

Mr. JONES. Senators got considerably excited along toward the end of the afternoon and we got all mixed up with reference to the different propositions. Whether I may



be mistaken or not, I am willing to assume all responsibility for it so far as that is concerned and take all the blame if that will help anybody out or relieve them from an embarrassing situation.

That is the situation which confronts us. There are two policies involved, first, whether we want the money really saved or, second, whether we want to use it for hiring other people. I do not think this is the time when we want to consider employing new employees.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES. I would like to say what I have to say and then quit, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. There was no question in my mind, and I do not think in the mind of any other Senator, about the hiring of new employees, as the Senator said, but rather the possibility that under a smaller appropriation, with the furlough or the pay cut, it might not be necessary to discharge so many employees.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there any question pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is not. The Chair attempted to lay a perfectly proper message before the Senate, but objection was made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. Then all of this debate is out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Regular order!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

#### WAR DEBTS, FARM RELIEF—STATEMENT BY B. M. BARUCH

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by Mr. B. M. Baruch on war debts, farm relief, and certain other economic and fiscal problems.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

[New York Herald Tribune, Monday, June 27, 1932]

BARUCH OFFERS ECONOMIC IDEA FOR CONSIDERATION BY DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM BUILDERS—URGES PRIORITY FOR FARM, IDLE, FISCAL ISSUES—"IF WE FAIL TO MEET THESE EMERGENCIES," HE SAYS, "WE ARE INVITING DELUGE"—FAVORS WAGNER AID BILL—OPPOSES CANCELLATION OF WAR DEBTS AS "PEACE BRIBE"

CHICAGO, June 26.—In a remarkable statement given out here to-day, Bernard M. Baruch, of New York, set forth what he called "a recitation of economic principles."

While Mr. Baruch said these principles were applicable equally to both parties, his purpose in setting them forth was to influence the making of the Democratic platform.

Mr. Baruch declared he was not speaking for or against any particular candidate. He would not admit his statement was aimed against Governor Roosevelt or anyone else. He said he was astonished to find those assembled for the convention talking more about prohibition than about the much more important question of what is to be done for the man out of a job.

Mr. Baruch said his primary concern was for the new generation coming on, for the young men and women. He declared they had a right to expect that the door of opportunity be not closed to them and that present economic conditions be righted.

#### FAVORS WAGNER BILL

Mr. Baruch called for economy in government—Federal, State, and local—for real relief to agriculture and not "illusory platitudes" of campaign years, and for repeal of the eighteenth amendment, though he dismissed this with a few brief words. He said employment depended on recovery of business, but in the meantime such emergency expedients as the Wagner bill should be utilized in order to see that "no means are left unused to prevent physical suffering."

"If we fail in this," he said, "we invite the deluge."

Mr. Baruch said the fiscal, agricultural, prohibition, and employment problems are emergency and should have "priority." He called for consideration after these of such things as tariff, reparations, war debts, and disarmament.

He declared against shifting the burden of the European war debts to the shoulders of the American people. "Adjustment of reparations, disarmament, or any other return to international sanity, bought by us through debt forgiveness, would not be worth the parchment on which such a treaty might be written," declared Mr. Baruch.

#### TEXT OF THE STATEMENT

Mr. Baruch called for the nomination of a man of "sincerity, responsibility, and patriotism sufficient to hold these principles above any consideration of personal or party advantage."

The statement of Mr. Baruch follows:

"This great crisis goes to the very right of man to earn his daily bread. There has been no violence, because all have suffered, because no one is being exploited and because everyone has recognized the duty to help to the limit. We are all in the same boat."

"To many the enemy seems hard to locate and to bring to grips. Yet the situation is not hopeless if we know and face realities and if we are willing to reject those 'isms' which have always proved roads to greater disaster."

"First, Our people must know the facts concerning the Government's own finances. They must then insist on such genuine and effective economy, such dependable and rational revenue measures, and such candor and skill in Federal finance as will end the reign of fiscal and economic doubt which has paralyzed our economic life during the last three years. Reform in this regard is indispensable to recovery and to the success of any plan for the betterment of present conditions."

#### URGES BILLION CUT IN UNITED STATES COSTS

"New tax burdens are not the answer. The weakness of our political system is such that the more the available revenue the greater the reckless squandering. The essence of fiscal reform is to cut the cost of government. Platform generalities about 'economical administration' will not serve. One billion dollars can and must be set as the measure of reduction."

"Federal statements of existing and prospective deficits and Federal financing of deficits and extraordinary expenditures must be put on a forthright basis. Our new, unscientific, and hasty revenue law is wholly insufficient in yield and it is bad enough in substance to prostrate even active business. It must be rationalized and made sufficient."

"What is said of the Federal Government's spending and taxing is equally applicable to the spending and taxing of States, counties, and municipalities."

"Unless these things are done promptly, there will be no hope for this generation, and our oncoming youth will be slaves chained to the oars of this economic galley. Youth has the right to refuse this cruel inheritance, and we, of this generation, are in duty bound to change this stupid bequest before it is too late."

#### FISCAL REFORM NECESSARY

"With unnecessary spending reduced to balance a sane and dependable revenue, and with Federal fiscal administration reformed, confidence in our financial institutions will replace the fear generated by the last three years. A plentitude of money will flow out of hiding, seeking investment. Suddenly we shall realize that the elements of our great wealth remain intact. Business will revive, and as a Nation we shall advance to the enjoyment of a rich future. No matter what emergency plans we try, this can never happen so long as the present timid, selfish, and political administration of Federal finance continues."

"Second. On the eve of every election our ruined agriculture has been fed illusory platitudes, and every time it has been fooled thereby. There can be no recovery with half our population within our tariff walls and the rest thrust outside. Our farmers deserve an American price for that part of their export production consumed within the American market. That equity has been recognized in many previous platforms. It has never been accorded. It is an immediate and indispensable necessity to economic recovery."

"Third. Every element of the liquor question has been sufficiently discussed. The eighteenth amendment should be repealed."

"Fourth. Employment depends on recovery of business. That can be had by attending to the three fundamentals just considered, and in no other way. In the meantime, the best we can do is to see to it, by such emergency expedients as the Wagner bill, that no means are left unused to prevent physical suffering. If we fail in this we invite the deluge. But if we fail to return to the homely virtues of equity, courage, and candor in government, neither the Wagner bill nor the reconstruction finance act nor any other palliative can succeed, and we deserve the deluge."

#### DEMANDS PRIORITY FOR THEM

"The fiscal, agricultural, prohibition, and employment problems are in a field which I call emergent. In the Great War what we call 'priority' was given to the more essential matters. So, now, we must give 'priority' to these most immediate problems. Everything else must be deferred. Nevertheless, we can not afford to err in the deferred class, in which are the questions of the tariff, reparations, disarmament, and war debts."

"By the Smoot-Hawley tariff we have induced an international honeycomb of water-tight economic compartments, and almost ruined the commerce of the world. But it would be piling blunder upon blunder to reduce our wall now in favor of all comers, by a horizontal slash. This is not a matter for general international conference. It is a matter for separate trading, conducting by our own competent negotiators who should deal with representatives of each great commercial nation, and arrive by mutual give-and-take at separate agreements, which would restore to our agriculture and our industry the great export markets lost to them by recent plunders in the international field."

#### OPPOSED DEBT CANCELLATION

"Economic administration touching the vast volume of European debts has been equally inept. It is exemplified by such exhibitions as that of our chief debtors under the protection of a moratorium we had granted them, thereafter threatening our monetary standard by implacable withdrawals of our gold. For us to shift the burdens of these debts from the shoulders of their people to those of our people would be a fatuity equaled only by the other para-



doxes of the present depression. There may come a time when meeting in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and with at least as much regard for the welfare of our own people as for that of our neighbors we can adjust these burdens to realities.

"But let us not now rush forth on any quixotic policy of wholesale forgiveness induced by platitudes from the mouths of unsound doctrinaires. Let us not now handicap our economic future for the benefit of competitors. They are perhaps so greatly distressed as we, but by reason of their own peculiar elements of economic strength they will be quite as well fitted as we to compete for the commerce of the world when times again approach normality.

#### REPARATIONS AND DEBTS

"Reparations and debts must be kept separate, but there is a certain reciprocal relation. This question is almost exclusively European. Yet, in consideration of the value of peace to the world, we could well afford to contribute any aid within our power but never as a bribe. Adjustment of reparations, disarmament, or any other return to international sanity bought by us through debt forgiveness would not be worth the parchment on which such a treaty might be written.

"If the age-old enmities among Teuton, Gaul, and Pole could be composed on some spontaneous and honest basis, that would be an event which we could well afford to celebrate by any reasonable concession. But we must not attempt to force these things by gifts or inducements. They must come from European nations themselves, acting for their own permanent and enlightened self-interest.

"This is a recitation of economic principles equally applicable to both parties. It is not exaggerating to say that application of them is necessary to sustain our national life. They have thus far failed even of recognition, owing to the timidity, selfishness, and obtuseness generated by partisan politics.

"I do not make political pronouncements, but I do venture to hope that, in this hour of trial and danger, the Democrats will select a man of sincerity, responsibility, and patriotism sufficient to hold these principles above any consideration of personal or party advantage—a man who will possess enough of stability of character, force, and courage to make them effective in spite of all opposition."

Mr. Baruch was chairman of the War Industries Board from March 5, 1918, to January 1, 1919.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives relative to certain amendments to House bill 11361, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was read, as follows:

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 27, 1932.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to amendments of the Senate Nos. 39, 62, and 69 to the bill (H. R. 11361) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For the acquisition of land in the municipal center, and for grading and paving of streets, and relocation and construction of District of Columbia owned utilities within and/or adjacent to the municipal center, \$222,000, and in addition thereto not to exceed \$1,278,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the municipal center contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932, of which sums not to exceed \$900,000 shall be available for the acquisition of land in the municipal center, and not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for grading and paving of streets, and relocation and construction of District of Columbia owned utilities within and/or adjacent to the municipal center: *Provided*, That the Washington Railway & Electric Co. is hereby directed to rebuild and relocate at its own expense the tracks of said company in D Street NW. between Fifth Street and Indiana Avenue, and in Indiana Avenue east of Fifth Street to the vicinity of Second Street, in accordance with plans and profiles to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and in the event of the failure of said Washington Railway & Electric Co. to perform the work herein directed within the time fixed by the said commissioners the said work shall be performed by the District of Columbia, and this appropriation shall be available for such purposes, and the cost of said work shall be a valid and subsisting lien against the franchises and property of the said railway company, and shall constitute a legal indebtedness of said company in favor of the District of Columbia, and the said lien may be enforced in the name of the District of Columbia by a bill in equity brought by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, or by any other lawful proceeding against the said railway company."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 135 and concur therein, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

#### "EMERGENCY RELIEF

"For the purpose of affording relief to residents of the District of Columbia who are unemployed or otherwise in distress because of the existing emergency, to be expended by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, by loan, employment, and/or direct relief, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and without regard to the provisions of any other law, to be immediately available, payable from the revenues of the District of Columbia, \$350,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$35,000 of this amount shall be available for administrative expenses including necessary personal services."

Mr. BINGHAM obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I do not ask the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 22 and 135 to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is something before the Senate now. Recurring to the economy bill, there is a simple proposition involved whether the Senate wants to use the money that is saved by the furloughs to employ other employees or additional employees, or whether it really wants to save the money by impounding it in the Treasury. The other things the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] has mentioned I shall not discuss at this time. All I will do is to ask the Senate to refrain from forming an opinion as to just what should be done to-morrow on the motion to reconsider the vote.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss the proposition any further to-night except to say that I want every Senator to consider what confronts the Senate now. If we do not pass the economy bill I do not know what we can do with reference to the appropriation measures that should be passed by Thursday night, and I fear that Government financial matters will be thrown into chaos. Whether the matters are of sufficient importance in this bill about which we may disagree to justify bringing about that state of affairs and that condition of things is for each Senator, of course, to determine for himself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments numbered 22 and 135 to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF REIMBURSABLE DEBTS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10884) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust reimbursable debts of Indians and tribes of Indians, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. SCHALL, and Mr. ASHURST conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED WHEAT AND COTTON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 418) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.



The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. KENDRICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, it will take me only a moment to present a matter of great importance to the Senate.

On June 24, 1932, President Hoover transmitted a communication to the Senate and the estimate of the Director of the Budget to make available the necessary funds to cover the expenses of the representatives of the United States to an international economic conference to be called by the British Government to meet in London during the summer. The international conference, according to the President's communication, is for "the purpose of considering various economic and monetary questions, including methods of improving world-market prices."

The discussion of "monetary questions" will include the greater monetary use of silver as supplementary to gold in carrying the increasing credit and currency burdens of the world. The outcome of such an international conference will undoubtedly result in great economic benefits not only to silver but in expediting the return to normal conditions of industry and trade, particularly in the Orient where silver is the dominant currency and the monetary standard.

Mr. President, I request permission to insert in the RECORD at this point the President's brief communication transmitting the supplemental estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN LONDON DURING THE YEAR 1932, AMOUNTING TO \$40,000

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1932, to remain available until June 30, 1933, amounting to \$40,000, for an International Economic Conference to be held in London during the year 1932.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its transmission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted herewith, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, June 24, 1932.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1932, to remain available until June 30, 1933, amounting to \$40,000.

International Economic Conference to be held in London during the year 1932: For the expenses of participation by the United States in an economic conference to be held in London during the year 1932, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926, amendments thereof or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto); personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended; stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent of offices and rooms; purchase of necessary books and documents; printing and binding; official cards, entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, fiscal year 1932, to remain available until June 30, 1933... \$40,000

There has been an exchange of views recently between the British and American Governments with regard to the desirability of convening a general economic conference, which would be for the purpose of considering various economic and monetary questions, including methods of improving world-market prices. The British Government later made the suggestion that the conference should be called by the British Government. After due consideration, this Government expressed the opinion that the early con-

vocation of the conference might be of real value in the present depression.

The purpose of this estimate is to provide for the expenses of participation of the United States in the conference.

The foregoing estimate is to meet a contingency which has arisen since the transmission of the Budgets for the fiscal years 1932 and 1933, and its approval is recommended.

Very respectfully,

J. CLAWSON ROOP,  
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDENT.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I herewith send to the desk an amendment, which I intend to propose to H. R. 12443, the second deficiency appropriation bill, to provide for the funds requested by the President, which I shall ask to be printed and also included in the RECORD at this point. Since the International Economic Conference is to meet in London this summer, the funds to cover expenses of our representatives will have to be made available before Congress adjourns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, and out of order, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and will also be printed in the RECORD in connection with the Senator's remarks at this point.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ODDIE to House bill 12443 is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ODDIE to House bill 12443, the second deficiency appropriation bill. Insert the following at the proper place in H. R. 12443, the second deficiency appropriation bill:

"That for the expenses of participation by the United States in an economic conference to be held in London during the year 1932, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926, amendments thereof or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto); personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended; stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent of offices and rooms; purchase of necessary books and documents; printing and binding; official cards; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$40,000, to remain available until June 30, 1933."

Mr. ODDIE. The President's communication further states that "after due consideration this Government expressed the opinion that the early convocation of the conference might be of real value in the present depression."

For some time past I have urged the necessity for an international monetary conference to discuss monetary gold and silver questions, and I am glad that the conditions now are favorable and that this Government is to participate. The solution of the monetary problem with an increased demand for silver for currency and in metallic monetary reserves is fundamental in overcoming the present depression and in laying the solid foundation upon which the world's industry and trade can be more securely built in the future.

#### METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I have been furnished with a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., urging Congress to enact necessary legislation to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase bonds of the Metropolitan Water District. I ask that the letter and accompanying resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and I invite the attention of Senators to the resolution and trust they will read it, as it will appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,  
Los Angeles, Calif., June 23, 1932.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose herewith copy of resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles on June 20, urging Congress to enact necessary legislation to permit the



Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase bonds of the Metropolitan Water District.

Very truly yours,

MAME B. BEATTY,  
Chief Clerk Board of Supervisors.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
Monday, June 20, 1932.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Henry W. Wright (chairman, presiding), Hugh A. Thatcher, Frank L. Shaw, Harry M. Baine, and John R. Quinn; and L. E. Lampton, clerk, by Mame B. Beatty, deputy clerk. (Minute book No. 180, p. —.)

IN RE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF: RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT NECESSARY LEGISLATION TO PERMIT THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION TO PURCHASE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT BONDS

On motion of Supervisor Baine, duly carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be, and the same is hereby, adopted, to wit:

"Whereas during existing conditions it is imperative that plans be made for the employment of heads of families by every possible means to forestall poverty and hunger that threaten so many of our citizens; and

"Whereas a \$220,000,000 bond issue was voted by the citizens of the metropolitan water district for construction of the Colorado River aqueduct and the validity of these bonds has been made certain by a decision of our State courts; and

"Whereas due to a stringency in the national-investment market it might be difficult to market these bonds through the usual channels of finance without costly sacrifice, but it is a policy of Federal Government to make possible income-yielding public works of this character through Government financing agencies; and

"Whereas a plan was suggested to officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, one of these Government agencies, whereby with a slight amendment to the enabling act creating that corporation and the provision of additional funds for its use, the corporation could purchase these and other bonds necessary for income-yielding public works, thus making possible the immediate beginning of construction of the Colorado River aqueduct, giving employment to thousands of men in the operations and giving employment to many additional thousands through the purchase of materials and equipment and their transportation; and

"Whereas such action would afford an immense stimulus to the return of prosperity in the Southwest, at the same time tending to greatly relieve our taxpayers of burdens created by the present urgent necessity for relief funds: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles*, That this body urges upon Congress the enactment, before adjournment of its present session, of legislation necessary to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase the bonds of the Metropolitan Water District from time to time in such quantities as will be required to begin and carry on the aqueduct construction; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the boards of supervisors in the counties of the Metropolitan Water District, to the city councils of each city in the district, to the chambers of commerce, and all other civic and business organizations and that they be urged to use their influence to bring about the required amendment and to prevail upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant the request for purchase of the bonds, thus supporting the officials and directors of the district in their plan and the members of the California delegation in Congress in their efforts to hasten the construction of the aqueduct."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles, State of California, on Monday, June 20, 1932, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

L. E. LAMPTON,  
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles,  
State of California, and Ex Officio Clerk of the  
Board of Supervisors of said County.  
By MAME B. BEATTY, Deputy.

[SEAL.]

PRINTING OF LAWS RELATING TO VETERANS OF VARIOUS WARS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I move that the managers of the conference on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) authorizing the printing and distribution of copies of the Federal laws relating to the veterans of various wars, be discharged from its further consideration, and that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably Senate resolution 247 and invite the attention of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] to it.

Mr. HEBERT. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the resolution be reported for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 247) submitted by Mr. HEBERT on the 20th instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee on Unemployment Insurance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 960 additional copies of the hearings held before the select committee during the Seventy-first Congress on unemployment insurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR FORMER SERVICE MEN

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia is now present. I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4781, which relates to the veterans who are present here in Washington, respecting their food, sanitation, and housing.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if it is only a formal matter and will not be debated, I shall not object.

Mr. BLAINE. I debated the matter last Saturday.

Mr. McNARY. Has the chairman of the committee any objection to the request?

Mr. CAPPER. No; none at all.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4781.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Fred A. Bradley, of Buffalo, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y. (reappointment).

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Frederick W. Dallinger, of Massachusetts, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court.

Mr. HEBERT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Harlan Besson, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey, to succeed Phillip Forman, nominated to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reports will be placed on the calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees the calendar is in order.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of B. B. Montgomery to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] requested that that go over for this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

#### UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edgar Bernard Broussard to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.



Mr. McNARY. At the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, I ask that that nomination go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

#### FEDERAL FARM BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. B. Denman, to be a member of the Federal Farm Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Copeland	Kean	Oddie
Austin	Couzens	Kendrick	Reed
Barbour	Dickinson	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Bingham	George	La Follette	Schall
Black	Hale	McGill	Shortridge
Blaine	Hatfield	McNary	Smoot
Bratton	Hayden	Metcalf	Stephens
Brookhart	Hebert	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Jones	Nye	Vandenberg

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-six Senators having answered to their names, there is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. STEIWER answered to his name when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is not a quorum present.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. An order having been entered at the opening of the Congress that until further order the Senate should meet at 12 o'clock, if the motion of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to, will the Senate meet at 12 o'clock to-morrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will adjourn in executive session until 12 o'clock to-morrow. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, in executive session, at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 28, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATION

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1932*

#### MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD

C. B. Denman to be a member of the Federal Farm Board.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We trust that we are deeply grateful, blessed Lord, as we bow in Thy holy presence and look unto Thee as the one perfect source of all wisdom, goodness, and mercy. As Thy children we pray Thee to attend us in all our ways. Stay our souls upon this undying truth, "The memory of the just is blessed." We praise Thee that there is an everlasting equity and that unselfish toil shall never be forgotten. O God, let this immortal truth break forth and bear the fruits of happiness, contentment, and brotherhood throughout our land; hasten the day when justice shall prevail everywhere. Oh, may it soon come to pass when men shall have learned to love as they have learned to hate; thus the contagion and

the pestilence which blacken the soul shall be no more. Let Heaven's blessings abide with our Speaker, the Members, the officers, and the employees of this Congress. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 24, 1932, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9349) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11267) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 46, to the bill (H. R. 11267) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes," that the Senate further insists on its amendments Nos. 46 to 168, inclusive, to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JONES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. HALE, Mr. BROUSSARD, and Mr. BRATTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 14, 15, 30, 56, and 82 to the bill (H. R. 7912) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes;" still further insists upon its amendment No. 77 to said bill, asks a still further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES, Mr. KEYES, Mr. KENDRICK, and Mr. HAYDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 96) entitled "An act to punish the sending through the mails of certain threatening communications," requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. BORAH, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. WALSH of Montana to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 437. An act to require a contractor to whom is awarded any contract for public buildings or other public works or for repairs or improvements thereon in the District of Columbia to give bond for the faithful performance of the contract, for the protection of persons furnishing labor and materials, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5062. An act to authorize the exchange of potassium-bearing lands in Tooele County, Utah, between the United States and private owners;

H. R. 5651. An act to amend chapter 15 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to the condemnation of land for public use;

H. R. 8766. An act to amend the sixth exception in section 3 of the immigration act of 1924 with reference to non-immigrant status of certain aliens;

H. R. 10246. An act to fix the fees to be charged for the issue of domestic money orders;

H. R. 10494. An act to provide a postage charge on notices to publishers regarding undeliverable second-class matter;

H. R. 10600. An act to exempt from the quota husbands of American citizens;

H. R. 10884. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust reimbursable debts of Indians and tribes of Indians;